



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

No. 142

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 22, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RENEE L. ELLMERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

THE MUFFIN MAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, do you know the muffin man, the muffin man, the muffin man? Yes, I know the muffin man, but he doesn't live on Drury Lane. He lives at the Department of Justice on Justice Lane and is growing rich on selling \$16 muffins at Justice Lane.

The Department of Justice's inspector general states that at only 10 conferences the Department of Justice spent almost \$500,000 on refreshments.

That's \$50,000 per conference for just refreshments. And that includes \$4,200 for 250 muffins.

Madam Speaker, how come these critters cost \$16 apiece? These are some high-dollar muffins that the Department of Justice is buying for its refreshments at conferences. Where do you even find a muffin that costs \$16? I've never seen one. Maybe they're shipped in from a special bakery in France with some secret ingredient. My favorite bakery, RAO's in Beaumont, Texas, tells me these things should be about \$2 apiece.

So why is the Justice Department with all those fancy lawyers letting the muffin man get away with this price gouging? Because the government doesn't care. It lives high on the hog with taxpayers' money.

So, Madam Speaker, do you know the muffin man, the muffin man? I know the muffin man, and the government should quit spending somebody else's money to keep the muffin man rolling in the dough.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As Washington appears to be trapped in partisan gridlock, sliding to budget paralysis and the potential of another government shutdown looming, there is one particular area that doesn't get the attention it merits, even as it is the key to our economic recovery. This is our serious and ever-growing infrastructure deficit. America's roads, bridges, water systems, transit, aviation ports all are in serious need of repair.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has, over the years, given grades

every 5 years to the state of infrastructure in the United States. Sadly, the latest survey showed that we are still getting a failing grade, and the gap necessary to bring these resources up to standard is growing larger, over \$2.3 trillion for 5 years to make it in a reasonable state of repair.

For example, we lose 6 billion gallons of water every day through leaks in aging pipes and sewer mains throughout the country. This is enough water to fill 9,000 Olympic-sized swimming pools. If you laid them end to end, you could swim from Washington, D.C., to Pittsburgh in the amount that is leaked every single day.

But it doesn't end there. In terms of the sad state of rail, deteriorating bridges, here is an opportunity for us to step forward dealing with a serious challenge that threatens America's productivity, threatens America's environmental and physical health, and puts hundreds of thousands of Americans to work at family wage jobs virtually overnight.

Madam Speaker, in times past, investment in infrastructure has been something that has captured the vision for the United States; but more than that, it has been part of how we have repaired some of our problems fiscally.

Remember in 1982, Ronald Reagan approved, as part of his budget stabilization program, a 5-cent a gallon increase in a user fee for gasoline that helped put the budget in balance and be able to finance needed infrastructure.

In 1993, as part of the Clinton program that led to the first balanced budgets that we had seen in decades, every year the deficit declined until the last 3 years he was in office, three successive years of increasing budget surplus, while we had an unprecedented increase in jobs, they included a modest gas tax increase.

There are a whole host of areas for user fees. I have bipartisan legislation for a water trust fund that would deal

□ 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.

H6347

with the problem I mentioned a moment ago. We have the superfund tax on the petrochemical industry to pay for the damage to the environment that they created that expired in 1995 and has not been renewed but we still have the superfunds to clean up, pushing that burden on State and local governments and on businesses that are required to spend money that wasn't their fault, giving the petrochemical industry a pass.

There's an opportunity, Madam Speaker, as the supercommittee is meeting, for Congress to step up in a bipartisan way to have resources to help rebuild and renew America. We're falling behind the Chinese. We're falling behind the Indians, the Brazilians, and the European Union, even while unemployment in the building trades is 20 percent or more from coast to coast.

There's an opportunity here for us to be able to stabilize the budget, deal with the infrastructure deficit, put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work virtually overnight, and maybe, just maybe, work together to heal the frayed political process here in Washington, D.C.

FUND FEMA NOT AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

You know, Madam Speaker, it is so ironic that the American people are hurting in many, many ways, including those in my district from Hurricane Irene which did damage all of the way up to Vermont, the fires in Texas, and tornadoes, and yet we can't come together as two different parties to find agreement to increase the funding for FEMA so they can help victims of these disasters, and yet we can find \$10 billion a month to send to a corrupt leader in Afghanistan so that he can wear his robes and his caps and American kids can die and lose their legs and arms.

I do not understand why this Congress and the President of the United States do not understand that it's time to bring our troops home.

□ 1010

The American people are hurting in many, many ways, and the folly of the last day here in Washington where we cannot come together to increase the funding for FEMA is absolutely unacceptable—unacceptable—to the people of this country.

I was listening to C-SPAN coming in today, and it was just really somewhat ironic that the people are so angry with Congress, both parties actually, and cannot figure out why we are not doing what's necessary to fix the economy and create jobs to fix the infrastructure that my friend from Oregon just talked about. Oh, yes, but we can still find \$10 billion a month for Mr.

Karzai. Let's fix his roads in Afghanistan. Let's train his people to be troops and policemen.

Madam Speaker, that brings me to this poster I brought down to the floor today. Two little girls, Stephanie and Eden, their daddy, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, a United States marine stationed in Camp Lejeune, which is in my district, and Colonel Palmer, stationed at Cherry Point Marine Air Station, which is in my district, were sent to Afghanistan to train Afghans to be policemen.

One night, they were having dinner, the trainees, the colonel, and the sergeant, and one trainee pulled out a pistol and killed both of them. What is ironic is the day before Sergeant Balduf and Colonel Palmer were killed, Sergeant Balduf emailed his wife, Amy, and said: I don't trust them. I don't trust them. I don't trust any of them.

So these two little girls are standing at their daddy's funeral at Arlington. And you can see in their faces, Madam Speaker, a look of pain and a look of misunderstanding of what has happened. They don't understand what has happened.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope we in Congress will find the will to encourage President Obama to bring our troops home, because Secretary Gates has already said and been recorded that we will be there until 2015. How many young Americans have to die in the next 4 years to prop up a corrupt government? It makes no sense.

I hope the American people will rally behind those of us in both parties who want to bring our troops home, and let's get them home before 2015.

Madam Speaker, I close this way, the way I always do: God, please bless our men and women in uniform; God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform; God, in Your loving arms hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq; God, please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in God's eyes for God's people; and I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

HOUSING FORECLOSURES

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I'm taking the floor today to talk about foreclosures.

The problem of housing foreclosures in this country continues to be one of the central reasons our economy is not moving forward. While a lot of this economic wreckage is avoidable, this Congress continues to fiddle while the American housing market burns. Families across this country are being

tossed out in the street, and many of them don't need to be—and we can help them. We can help fix the housing market so that millions of American families can stay in their homes and others can have a smooth transition into renting. We could help, but this Congress is doing nothing.

Millions of homeowners are suffering through the worst recession in 100 years, and the Republican majority is not doing one single thing to help them. Just look at this map next to me. This is a snapshot of foreclosures across this country. The dark red areas are where the worst places are, but you see it covers everybody in the country.

Now, there isn't a district that isn't affected by this crisis. The housing market doesn't care about your politics. Three years after the Wall Street meltdown, millions of Americans are still facing foreclosure. One in four homeowners in this country is underwater, and home prices continue to drop.

While the housing market continues to steadily destruct and millions of Americans are needlessly pushed into poverty, this Congress isn't doing anything to stop it. Instead of fixing the economy, today we're going to debate a bill—a Republican bill—that attacks public health and children. The Republican priority is not foreclosures. It is to make sure that every American is breathing more mercury and toxins.

When the Democrats were in charge, it was different. We thought you should be able to write down mortgage principal in bankruptcy and modify mortgages more easily and get lenders to the bargaining table to avoid foreclosure. But the last Congress, Republican Senators stopped all that. And in this Congress, the Republicans in the House want to make sure we don't do anything. Instead, they cut programs for foreclosures and cut affordable housing. Instead of taking actions, Republicans say the market will fix it. In the market we trust. Not in God we trust, but in the market we trust that everything will be better.

But we're losing. We're long past a healthy correction. The damage being done is completely unavoidable. Make no mistake, Republican economic philosophy is pushing millions of Americans into the street, middle class Americans.

It's important to remember it was the banks that caused this crisis. Well, we bailed out the banks, and how did they thank the American people for the bailout? The banks went into foreclosure overdrive. They robo-signed foreclosures and filed fraudulent documents as fast as they could.

FDR once said, "take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly, and try another. But by all means, try something." And we can act. By just reducing the principal on all underwater homes to fair market value, \$71 billion would be injected into the economy. Every homeowner would save about \$6,500 a year in payments, and millions of new jobs would be created.

□ 1020

Banks are still sitting on \$1 trillion in cash. By using 7 percent of that money, there would be millions of people kept out of poverty. The banks can afford it and it would be something we seem to have lost all sight of in Congress—it would be fair. We can restart the economy by helping homeowners. We can come out of this economic crisis by putting responsible homeowners on solid ground. The map says it all. Homeowners are struggling in every district of every Member of this Congress.

We can fix this foreclosure disaster. We can help American families who play by the rules. We could start action today and help the middle class. But, no, what are we going to do? We are going to fool around out here about the rules of the EPA that protect people against toxins and mercury.

This Congress has lost its way and it needs a change. And it's going to come, because all those people who are in foreclosure in this country when the next election comes are going to ask, "What did the Republicans in the House do?" And the answer is, "Nothing."

EPA'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

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

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Speaker, I came to Washington, D.C., 9 months ago with the hope that we would restore a little bit of common sense and a whole lot of spending control to Washington, D.C. I also came to Washington, D.C., having never heard of an eco-ambassador. Now I had heard of ambassadors and I am familiar with the environment, but I had never heard of an eco-ambassador.

Indeed, I had never heard of an eco-ambassador until just a few short weeks ago when our Environmental Protection Agency that has done so much damage to our economy, so much damage to our Kansas' Fourth Congressional District, our farmers, our manufacturers, and our families, our Environmental Protection Agency decided at this time of massive Federal deficits that we needed a new program to create eco-ambassadors—eco-ambassadors, each of which will be given \$6,000 of your money, eco-ambassadors which, in exchange for that money, will come to Washington, D.C., and go back to their home places and work for 20 weeks—20 weeks for \$6,000—part-time at that—for their internship program.

When you read the requirements to be eligible to receive an eco-ambassador internship position, you will be fascinated to see that it is an ideologically driven program. Students who apply must have a strong interest in environmental justice, social justice issues, and other issues relating to environmental health disparities in health, volunteer, or employment settings. This is a liberals-only policy.

The Environmental Justice internship is of course administered with your taxpayer dollars. We don't need a program like this at any time; we certainly don't need it at this time.

So I have offered a bill, H.R. 2876, the EPA Student Nondiscrimination Act. It simply says that when you apply for employment with the Federal Government, we're not going to seek to find out whether you agree with this administration's radical environmental agenda. We're not going to seek to find out if you have worked as a community organizer. All we're going to ask is that you are qualified for the position.

Now, there are many efforts and many concerns about environmental disparities across the country. I share those concerns, but our EPA and our Justice Department already have many remedies for folks who feel like they have been discriminated against. What we don't need is yet another Federal program aimed at trying to solve a problem that we know can't be solved in Washington, D.C.

I'll close with this thought: this is a small program. The total dollars expended in the scale of our massive Federal deficit are very, very small; but it is symptomatic of a place, Washington, D.C., that has become completely disconnected from America and common-sense values, the values that we all have in Kansas. We don't need eco-ambassadors. We don't need this program. And I would ask my colleagues to support my legislation to eliminate it.

IT'S NOT TOO LATE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. It's not too late. That's my message to Palestinian Authority President Abbas, who has announced his intention to seek unilateral Palestinian statehood at the United Nations this Friday. It's not too late to abandon this reckless route, engage in direct negotiations with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu, and choose the path to peace.

There is only one road to a peace agreement, and that is through direct talks between Israelis and Palestinians. This course forward is clearly outlined in the Oslo Peace Agreement, which states that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must be resolved through direct, two-party negotiations. Anything outside of these direct talks—particularly this Palestinian appeal for U.N. recognition—is a dangerous digression from the known way forward.

In addition to veering from the track toward two states, a status upgrade at this time could allow the Palestinians to pursue cases against Israel in international institutions such as the International Criminal Court. Such institutions could even be used to request advisory rulings on final status issues,

further circumventing two-party negotiations.

The U.S. has also made significant investments in bolstering Palestinian security and economic prosperity, all in an effort to enable the Palestinians to make the difficult concessions necessary to move toward peace. This appeal to the U.N. and rejection of direct two-party talks directly undermines considerable American efforts and investments in a peace deal. Abbas and the Palestinians need to come back to the negotiating table, and it is the U.S. that needs to lead them back and spearhead negotiations.

As a true and steadfast friend to Israel, there has never been a more vital time for America to stand strong with our ally. With the excitement and hope of the Arab Spring has also come a great deal of uncertainty—uncertainty about the strength of the relationship between Israel and Turkey; uncertainty about the willingness of the Egyptians to hold true to their promises under the benchmark 1979 peace treaty; uncertainty about the security of the Sinai; uncertainty surrounding the speed with which Iran marches toward a nuclear bomb; and uncertainty about the number of rockets being stockpiled by Hezbollah and Hamas aimed at the homes of Israeli citizens.

But there is one thing that must never be uncertain: America's support for Israel. A threat to Israel's security or legitimacy is a threat to America, and we will not stand by and let Israel face these challenges alone. Upon her founding over six decades ago, the United States was the first Nation to recognize Israel. And since that recognition, the special bond between Israel and the U.S. has only grown stronger on the bedrock of the mutual principles of freedom, justice, and peace. Now is the time to stand with our old friend and lead the way to peace.

It is moments like these that test our mettle. It is moments like these that are recorded in our history books. And it is moments like these where we must show our leadership.

America must do everything in its power to end this perilous Palestinian bid for unilateral statehood and get direct negotiations between the two parties back on track. And President Abbas must know there will be consequences for choosing the path of confrontation over that of negotiation.

The course to unilateral recognition is not free. The Israeli-Palestinian peace process is at a pivotal crossroad. The Palestinians can choose to pursue the dead-end track toward U.N. recognition, or they can adjust their course in their wrongheaded U.N. bid and sit down at the negotiating table with Israel. The choice is theirs. It's not too late to choose the path toward peace.

CALAMITY OVER KLAMATH
AGREEMENT

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this generation is facing spiraling electricity prices and increasingly scarce supplies. Californians have had to cut back to the point that their electricity consumption per capita is now lower than that of Guam, Luxembourg, and Aruba.

What is the administration's solution? Interior Secretary Ken Salazar announced yesterday that the administration is moving forward with a plan to destroy four perfectly good hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River, capable of producing 155,000 megawatts of the cleanest and cheapest electricity on the planet, enough for about 155,000 homes.

Now, why would the administration pursue such a ludicrous policy? Well, they say it's necessary to increase the salmon population. Well, the thing is, we did that a long time ago by building the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery. The Iron Gate Fish Hatchery produces 5 million salmon smolt every year—17,000 of which return annually as fully grown adults to spawn. The problem is, they don't include them in the population count. And to add insult to insanity, when they tear down the Iron Gate Dam, we will lose the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery and the 5 million salmon smolt it produces annually.

Declining salmon runs are not unique to the Klamath. We have seen them up and down the Northwest Pacific coast over the last 10 years as a result of the naturally occurring Pacific decadal oscillation—cold water currents that fluctuate over a 10-year cycle between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. In fact, during the same decade that salmon runs have declined throughout the Pacific Northwest, they have exploded in Alaska. We are now at the end of that cycle.

The cost of this madness is currently pegged at a staggering \$290 million, all at the expense of ratepayers and taxpayers. But that's just the cost of removing the dams. Consumers will face permanently higher prices for replacement power, which, we're told, will be wind and solar.

Well, not only are wind and solar many times more expensive; wind and solar require equal amounts of reliable standby power, which is precisely what the dams provide. We're told that, yes, this may be expensive, but it will cost less than retrofitting the dams to meet cost-prohibitive environmental requirements. Well, if that's the case, maybe we should rethink those requirements, not squander more than a quarter billion dollars to destroy desperately needed hydroelectric dams. Or here is a modest suggestion to address the salmon population—count the hatchery fish.

We're told that this is the result of a local agreement between farmers and

stakeholders. Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the Klamath agreement was the result of local farmers succumbing to extortion by environmental groups that threatened lawsuits to shut off their water. And obviously the so-called "stakeholders" don't include the ratepayers and taxpayers who will pay dearly for the loss of these dams.

Indeed, local voters have repeatedly and overwhelmingly repudiated the agreement and the politicians responsible for it. The locally elected Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors vigorously opposes it.

□ 1030

Finally, the administration boasts of 1,400 short-term jobs that will be created to tear down these dams. Just imagine how many jobs we could create if we tore down the Hoover Dam or Duluth, Minnesota.

Madam Speaker, amidst a spending spree that threatens to bankrupt this Nation, amidst spiraling electricity prices and chronic shortages, to tear down four perfectly good hydroelectric dams at enormous cost is insane. And to claim that this is good for the economy gives us chilling insight into the breathtakingly bad judgment that is misguiding our Nation from the White House.

The President was right about one thing when he spoke here several weeks ago. Fourteen months is a long time to wait to correct the problem. Fortunately, the administration will need congressional approval to move forward with this lunacy, and that's going to require action by this House.

Earlier this year the House voted to put a stop to this nonsense. I trust it will exercise that same good judgment as the administration proceeds with its folly.

HAPPY 50TH BIRTHDAY TO THE
UNITED STATES PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a very, very special birthday. It is the 50th birthday of the United States Peace Corps, an incredible organization that was started by President John F. Kennedy and a whole lot of people that thought that this Nation had an opportunity to reach out to the men and women of America, provide them with a challenge: to go out to the world to seek peace, to work for peace, and to help developing nations meet their needs, whether it be in education, community development, economic development, or other activities. And so it has been.

More than 200,000 Americans, young and old, men and women, have become Peace Corps volunteers. They have served in 139 countries around the world, and today they serve in over 70 countries. It's been a terrific program.

It has presented the very best face of America to millions of people around the world.

Today, there are leaders of many countries around this world that have been taught by Peace Corps volunteers in their high schools, in their grammar schools or universities. They have a very special understanding of America. They know Americans. They know that Americans have a big heart and they have a desire to see progress, economic and social progress in every country of this world.

And so today we celebrate 50 years. We celebrate over 200,000 Peace Corps volunteers that have served around the world, and we celebrate those who have been in the administration, the directors, the country directors, the doctors, the nurses, and the others who have been part of this enormously important part of America.

As those Peace Corps volunteers have returned to America, it is now clear in recent polling that they have continued to serve. They serve as volunteers at twice the rate of other Americans. And they are found in the schools, they are found in the community programs, and they're even found in Congress, as strange as that might seem. But, nonetheless, they've served in many, many ways, and they continue to do so.

Earlier today, I met two Peace Corps volunteers who were in the very first effort in Tanzania, then Tanganyika. They returned some 40 years later. I'm going to turn that around. They actually served in Afghanistan in the early sixties and then came back 40 years later to serve once again as Peace Corps volunteers.

And what we have found over these many years, that once you've become a Peace Corps volunteer, you never stop laboring for peace, wherever it may be. And so today we celebrate the 50th anniversary of a remarkable idea that was put forward by President John F. Kennedy, the idea that Americans could reach out to the whole world and serve wherever that need might be.

Happy birthday, Peace Corps.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND A
PALESTINIAN STATE

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

Mr. DOLD. I, too, want to send my happy birthday out to the Peace Corps, and certainly it's a great day to celebrate that birthday.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing at the United Nations this week is a brazen rejection of the basic principle of a negotiated peace. Tomorrow, Mahmoud Abbas will deliver a speech

at the United Nations where he is expected to formally announce a resolution to unilaterally seek the declaration of a Palestinian state.

While we are ultimately committed to a future where the two states, Israel and Palestine, are able to live side by side in long-term peace and security, while all of us in this Chamber heard directly from Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu in May on his nation's commitment to a two-state solution, the question I have and which I wish every nation in the world who will be voting on this issue should ask itself is: Are the Palestinians ready to make peace?

This is the key question and is what Prime Minister Netanyahu laid out in his remarks right here in this Chamber: "The conflict has never been about the establishment of a Palestinian state. It has always been about the existence of the Jewish state. That is what this conflict is about."

Madam Speaker, this unilateral declaration of independence is a direct challenge to the United States and the efforts and the dollars we have committed in recent years to promote a real, lasting peace. It is fundamental that peace cannot be imposed from the outside. It can only be made in Jerusalem and Ramallah.

There are too many difficult core issues which can only adequately be addressed through direct negotiations, which must be mutually accepted by governments on both sides, and, most importantly, which must be ratified by the people who live there. Without these vital elements, you don't have peace. You don't even increase the chances for peace down the road. Rather, you undermine the prospects for achieving it in the future.

This is the point of this unilateral declaration. Where is the commitment to peace on the Palestinian side?

Palestinian officials have made it clear that this unilateral effort is another means of isolating Israel and escalating the conflict against her. Palestinian officials have made it clear that they seek to advance this bid so that they can attack Israel through the international legal system, including taking actions against Israel in the International Court of Justice.

The tragic reality, Madam Speaker, is that Israel lives in a very dangerous region of the world, and the Israeli people absolutely have grave security concerns that should not simply be tossed aside by countries that are allies of the United States of America. The Israeli people are surrounded by hostile neighbors that want to drive Israel out of existence. We here in America must understand the reality on the ground and the threats Israel faces each and every day.

Israel is a peace-seeking democracy, and the Israeli people simply want to live in peace and security. Iran has its proxies closing in: Hamas in Gaza; to the south there's the Muslim Brotherhood, now gaining significant power in Egypt; Hezbollah is in the north; and in the northeast is Syria, led by Assad.

The recent downgrade in relations by Turkey is very serious. The instability of the Sinai is of enormous concern. This is a dangerous neighborhood, and recent events are bringing into sharp view Israel's daily reality—increased isolation and living under siege.

As we witnessed with the flotilla last year, with the storming of Israel's Embassy in Cairo 2 weeks ago, or with Turkey's new aggressive, bellicose rhetoric and actions, Turkey, who until very recently had enjoyed a successful diplomatic and economic partnership with the State of Israel, events in the Middle East can easily spiral out of control and lead to outcomes that nobody desires.

Fortunately, the Members of this Chamber have made it clear to the entire world that we will not sit idly by during the continued delegitimization of the State of Israel and the international community. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in both parties who have continued to beat the drum and call this unilateral attempt exactly what it is—an effort to circumvent direct negotiations and undermine peace.

□ 1040

I am pleased that the President is committed to vetoing this unilateral attempt in the Security Council if it does come to a vote, and I appreciate his administration's focus on this particular critical issue.

We must continue in our efforts to urge the nations of the world to stand with the United States, support peace efforts in the Middle East, and oppose this resolution.

Peace between Israel and her Palestinian neighbors cannot be achieved unless both sides sit and find common ground. Unilateral declarations and third parties cannot do it for them. The only path forward is for the Israelis and the Palestinians to sit together and find peace. It is time for Mr. Abbas to come back to the table—his actions and decisions here must not be rewarded; our allies in the world should recognize this—otherwise they are legitimizing and ratifying the Palestinian refusals to negotiate.

OPPOSING AUTOMATED KILLER DRONES

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, there was an article in The Washington Post earlier this week that we should all find very unsettling and disturbing.

We know that in recent years the Pentagon has increasingly used unmanned drone aircraft to carry out violent acts of war. And frankly, that's bad enough. But now there's a new and even more frightening technology in the works. It's called "lethal autonomy." And under the system, the drones would no longer be remotely op-

erated and controlled by actual human beings. The lethal autonomy drones would be computer programmed to carry out their deadly mission independently. No human hand providing steering and guidance.

I can't even begin to wrap my head around the humanitarian red flags associated with this experiment in robotics.

Software can break down. It could even be hacked. Furthermore, computers don't have a conscience. They aren't nimble, they can't make snap decisions based on new information or ethical considerations. They're programmed to do what they do without judgment, discretion, or scruples. You can just imagine, or I can anyway, mass civilian atrocities thanks to a robot drone raging out of control.

Thankfully, a group called the International Committee for Robot Arms Control is speaking up and making these points. Pointing out that if we have a treaty banning land mines, why not one that outlaws these automatic killer drones.

According to the Post, the military has begun to grapple with the implications of this technology. Well, I can really suggest that they continue grappling before using these technologies and finding the flaws and possible harmful and unpredictable consequences.

One advocate of these new drones believes it's possible to program them to comply with international law regarding the conduct of hostilities. Well, I'm certainly skeptical. We couldn't even get the last President of the United States to understand and abide by the Geneva Conventions. I don't know how we're going to get a robot to do it.

Madam Speaker, the increasing dehumanization of warfare is part of a terrifying trend. Somehow it's easier to kill one another when we have computers and machines to carry it out for us, when we don't have to stare our own mayhem in the face.

As a member of the Science Committee, I'm totally enthusiastic about American high-tech innovation. But I believe we should be using our knowledge and ingenuity to give the civilian economy the boost it needs to create good jobs for hardworking middle class Americans and to create a smarter response to world conflict. All of this money we're funneling to defense contractors to devise evermore sophisticated ways to kill one another must be reinvested in alternatives to warfare and nonviolent ways to resolving conflict.

That's what my Smart Security plan does. I've discussed this many, many times from this very spot. It's called Smart Security. It defines military force as the very, very last resort. And it directs energy and resources toward diplomacy, democracy promotion, development, and peaceful ways of engaging with the rest of the world.

Madam Speaker, in two weeks' time we will have been at war for a full decade. More than 6,000 Americans have

died, 10,000 innocent Afghans and Iraqis have been killed for the cause of their so-called liberation. Many, many more of our own troops have been harmed and will always be living with the results of their injuries.

The time is now. The time is to stop building machines that can kill more efficiently and start bringing our troops home.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, we continue to suffer from an unemployment rate of over 10 percent, and America saw zero job growth in the month of August. Our Nation has a jobs crisis. So why is the Obama administration making it so difficult to create jobs?

Not only do we have a jobs crisis, but we also have a debt crisis. These two things are interconnected, and we certainly should not make one worse while making the other better.

The President has outlined his \$447 billion jobs plan, and it's essentially stimulus number two. It's the same recycled ideas that clearly didn't work from the last \$800 billion stimulus. At the same time, the President wants to pay for his plan with \$1.5 trillion in new taxes.

It's estimated that small business owners would pay over half the taxes raised under this proposal, ultimately hitting our employers the hardest and creating an even worse environment for private sector job growth.

Tax increases destroy jobs. They're not an option.

Now, there are some issues we agree on. For example, infrastructure funding. That's an appropriate function of government. It's something we could do to boost a sagging economy. But the problem is mistrust. With the President's first stimulus, little went to actual infrastructure development.

Now, we agree that we must move forward on the three free trade agreements. By passing those agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea we'll increase competitiveness of American manufacturers and have an increase of 250,000 American jobs.

While we can find common ground on a few things, the President continues to show reluctance on impacting entitlement program solvency. His proposal seeks to strengthen the independent advisory board which was created by ObamaCare. This board of unelected bureaucrats was given way too much authority in the first place to determine what benefits are covered and how much physicians are paid.

The best way to control costs in Medicare is to increase choice and competition, not by empowering a group of unelected bureaucrats.

The Obama administration has created a triple threat of out-of-control

spending, excessive regulations, and higher taxes. And these three things have resulted in an environment that has destroyed the confidence and prevented job creators from hiring.

Washington must create an environment favorable to job creation and focus on removing this triple threat. First, we must continue to fight to rein in Washington's unrestrained spending.

This fall, the Congress will deal with a balanced budget agreement which would finally force Washington to live within its means and do what families, businesses, and local and State governments are already required to do, and that is balance their budgets.

We must focus on regulatory relief. Just recently the House passed a bill that would prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from dictating where an employer can and cannot locate jobs in the United States. Employers need to be allowed to invest in the State that offers the best economic climate for job creation.

This week we're going to vote on the TRAIN Act.

The Obama EPA has imposed unnecessary and burdensome regulations on businesses, and we want to determine how those regulations affect electricity prices, fuel prices, and unemployment.

□ 1050

The TRAIN Act will help uncover exactly how much the EPA is costing Mississippi consumers, farmers, small businesses, and State and local governments. These are just a few examples of the frustrating regulations that have come out of the Obama administration.

Lastly, we must concentrate on tax reform. The Joint Select Committee has the opportunity to lay the foundation for fundamental tax reform, but they must not enact tax increases. The American people don't need or want more solutions from the Federal Government. They want the Federal Government to get out of their way.

By tackling our spending problem, by removing excess regulations and by guaranteeing that taxes will not increase, we will unleash the American economy and give businesses the confidence they need to grow and create jobs.

POVERTY IN AMERICA

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

Ms. LEE of California. As founder of the congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, I rise today to continue sounding the alarm about the tide of poverty sweeping across this country.

Last week, the United States Census Bureau released its annual report, Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2010. It revealed a disturbing but unsurprising spike in the poverty rate—from 14.3 percent in 2009 to a staggering 15.1 percent in 2010.

In 2010, 46 million people lived in poverty in America. That is essentially

the populations of California and Michigan combined who are living in poverty in America. It's really a moral outrage that in the richest country in the world so many Americans are facing or are living in poverty, lacking economic opportunity and economic security.

Shamefully, our children bear the greatest burden. In 2010, 22 percent, or one in five children, lived in poverty. That's in America. Poverty continues to hit communities of color much harder, as the facts show. In 2010, the poverty rate for whites rose to 9.9 percent. The poverty rate for African Americans rose to 27.4 percent. The poverty rate for Latinos rose to 26.6 percent. For Asian Pacific Americans, the 2010 poverty rate of 12.1 percent remained the same.

This massive poverty crisis we are facing didn't happen overnight. Poverty rates began to rise during the Bush administration as 8 years of failed economic policy wiped out all of the gains made during the Clinton years. The co-chairs of the Out of Poverty Caucus saw this day coming, and while little attention has been placed on the poor, we are determined to prick the conscience of this Congress and to act to stem the tide of poverty across America.

The members of the congressional Out of Poverty Caucus sent a letter asking the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, more commonly known as the supercommittee, to stay in line with prior deficit reduction agreements of the past by not cutting programs that provide basic human services—the safety net. Of course, now more and more Americans need this safety net. We must not balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable. Unfortunately, now middle-income people are falling into the ranks of the poor. As many of us know, millions of people are just one paycheck away from poverty.

We really can turn the tide on poverty. The solution to boosting this stagnating economy, reducing our long-term deficits, and lifting Americans out of the crisis of poverty is really the same. We must invest in creating more stable, living wage jobs. In fact, the most effective anti-poverty program is an effective jobs program. That is why Congress must immediately pass the President's American Jobs Act to begin the work of creating jobs, reducing poverty, and jump-starting our economy.

Poverty rates have increased in rural and urban communities throughout the country. The American Dream has turned into a nightmare for millions. This is a crisis, but we must turn the tide, and we must start today. So I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop playing politics and to act on jobs now. We can and we must act urgently to turn the tide of poverty sweeping across the Nation—a tide, really, that knows no party affiliation.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S JOBS AND
DEFICIT REDUCTION BILLS

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I rise today with great disappointment in the administration's misguided agenda on job creation and deficit reduction.

You see, I have been in a family that has created jobs for generations. Shortly after World War II, my grandfather wanted to create an opportunity for his family. He wanted to create an opportunity to make a difference in his community. So, with a sixth-grade education, with \$3,000 of borrowed money, and with a dream to make a difference, he did what small businesses do naturally when they do not have the impediments of the Federal Government: He created jobs. His dream, his vision, included that—to make a difference, to give other people an opportunity to forge a brighter and better future for them and their families.

It wasn't a self-serving dream.

It was a dream to serve others.

During those decades following World War II, we saw that same example all across this great Nation of people doing what people were created to do—make a difference.

It is not government's responsibility to create a job through a bill. It is government's responsibility to create an environment, an environment that produces certainty, an environment that a small business owner has the guarantee that he knows what his taxes are going to be, that he knows what his fees are going to be, that he knows what his regulations are going to be, not just in 6 months or 12 months, but for years, and that creates certainty.

I had never served in elected office before being sworn in as a Member of this House in January. I went from small business to Congress, and so I bring with me that understanding that, if government gets out of the way and if we can do what Americans do better than any country in the world, we will make our communities a better place, and, yes, because of our benevolence, we will make the world a better place.

It was a great disappointment when the President came to this Chamber and the President introduced his plan. I was saddened. Yes, there were some things that I agreed with that we need to do—the free trade agreements. We are still waiting for those free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. We're waiting. There was agreement on tax reform. There was agreement on payroll tax reduction to give small businesses more money, to give individuals more money on their paychecks. We agreed there. But if you look deeper into this bill, you will see, unfortunately, more of the same.

This jobs bill creates a brand new, permanent, government-owned bureaucracy. As a matter of fact, it's a corporation—the President's American

Infrastructure Financing Authority, a solely owned subsidiary of the Federal Government. It is not time for the Federal Government to create corporations, corporations that have chief executive officers and chief financial officers, risk officers, chief compliance officers, chief operating officers, chief lending officers, general counsel, and boards of directors who are lending money—lending money—with terms out to 35 years.

Now, unfortunately, this is insanity. This sounds so much like the first stimulus—and the first stimulus, we know, with 35 percent of those funds having yet to be spent. We were promised our unemployment numbers would not go over 8 percent. As a matter of fact, the administration claimed that unemployment numbers by this time would be at 6.5. Well, we all know that is not true. As a matter of fact, in my home State of Florida, we're living with 10.7 percent unemployment, and, last year, we spent most of the year at 12—historic unemployment numbers.

□ 1100

Unfortunately, insanity, when you do the same thing over and over and over again, expecting different results, seems to be the order of the day; and that is not what the American people want right now. They want certainty. They want certainty to be able to work hard, to have honest dealings and to know that after they work hard and they're honest, that they will have a brighter future when they wake up tomorrow.

They deserve that. They deserve that and unfortunately this plan goes in the opposite direction. So it bothers me that with the regulations that we face, the cloud of uncertainty just grows.

Madam Speaker, I say in closing, business has never been asked to do more with less, and they clearly know less certainty.

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN
MILITARY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, as I come each week, to share yet another horrific story about rape in the military.

It is a black eye on this country that must be erased. Nineteen thousand rapes a year occur in the military. Those are figures determined by the Department of Defense itself. I encourage those who want to tell their story to email me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov.

Today I am going to talk about Seaman Kori Cioca, who served in the Coast Guard from August 2005 to June 2007. Her allegations are as follows:

Seaman Cioca was consistently threatened and harassed by her superior. On one occasion, when she made a mistake during a knot-tying quiz, he called her a "stupid bleeping female

who didn't belong in the military." Then he spit in her face.

She complained about her superior's abusive behavior and expressed fear of him to other military personnel in the chain of command. As is too often the case, this reporting led to her being punished and not the perpetrator.

Her superior began to drive past Cioca's home many times during the day and called her repeatedly, leaving her voice mails threatening her life. He then began to break into her room at night and stand over her bed. Seaman Cioca began sleeping with a knife under her pillow to defend herself.

During work one day, her superior thrust his groin into her buttocks as she bent over to pick up some trash. He then called her a "bleeping whore" and laughed. Seaman Cioca and another shipmate who witnessed the incident reported it to the command. Seaman Cioca requested a transfer, but it was denied.

At the end of November 2005, the superior broke into Seaman Cioca's room. He directed her to touch his genitals. When she refused loudly, he grabbed her hand and pushed it into his groin. When she yelled again and pushed her superior away, he struck her so hard in the face that she was thrown across the room and against a wall.

Seaman Cioca and two other shipmates, who witnessed the harassment, went to command and reported the assault. Command did nothing in response.

In December 2005, Seaman Cioca was ordered to go to retrieve some keys from her superior, who was in his stateroom. When he realized she was alone, he pulled her into the room, grabbed her by the hair and raped her.

Command obtained an admission of sex from the superior, but told Seaman Cioca that if she pressed forward with reporting the rape, she would be court-martialed for lying. They refused her pleas to take a lie detector test so she could prove her case.

The superior only pled guilty to hitting her. He got a slap on the wrist.

She, on the other hand, was forced to sign a paper saying she had an inappropriate relationship with her superior and was discharged.

As part of the discharge process, command made her stay in an all-male barracks for 60 days. She now suffers from PTSD and an abnormal EEG due to nerve damage in her face.

Cioca later told the press, "It's like they didn't care. It wasn't important. I wasn't important."

Well, Seaman Cioca, you are important, and it is important. And it's high time that the Congress of the United States take action to rid the military of rape.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

JOBS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's always an honor and privilege to speak in this body. There has just been so much information about the American Jobs Act that the President has touted that he demanded that we pass here in this room, and at the time he had no American Jobs Act.

The next day, Friday, he had spent millions of dollars, taxpayer dollars, running around the country demanding that people pass his bill. On Saturday, the same thing, all weekend, running around telling people to pass his American Jobs Act when there was no such bill.

Monday afternoon, very late, there became a bill. It's hard to believe that this is what came out of the White House because it does not represent what the President said he wanted to do, said he believed in. I'm sure he doesn't have time to go through and actually read and see that the things he's saying in his speech are completely opposite of what he's doing in his so-called American Jobs Act, but that's why, after 6 days of being beat up verbally by the President for not passing his American Jobs Act and finding that there was no such American Jobs Act on file here in the House, I felt like I needed to help the President by creating an American Jobs Act that really will create jobs. So I filed a two-page American Jobs Act that will do more than anything the President has talked about or put in writing to create jobs in America.

But just since the President is obviously not aware of what's actually in his bill based on what he's saying, in the limited time we have here, I wanted to touch on some of these things.

For example, the President said over and over and over that he wants to go after these greedy, big oil companies like British Petroleum, Exxon, Shell, those big companies, and that his American Jobs Act, his bill, actually will do that. It will go after their profits. He probably has no clue that the fact is the three pages of deductions that are eliminated for oil companies, they're basically for oil companies that produce less than a thousand barrels of oil a day. They don't even apply to the people that the President says he's going after for these unseemly profits they're making.

I'm sure he's also not aware, but the fact is that over 94 percent of all oil and gas wells drilled on the continental U.S. are done by independent oil producers who these three pages will devastate and put most out of business. And so the President, by these three pages, that I'm sure he doesn't really understand what they do, but the fact is they'll put the independent oil producers out of business.

They will affect the major oil companies because once over 94 percent of all

oil and gas wells in America and the continental U.S. are stopped, then the major oil companies that he's demonized will actually make more money than they've ever made in their history, and it will be the middle hard-working Americans that will pay the biggest price. They're the least able to afford dramatically higher gasoline prices, but that's what will happen.

We are also told that we're going to go after the millionaires and billionaires that have all this money and not paying their fair share. Now, to me, if we're going to make sure everybody pays their fair share, and you've got somebody like Warren Buffett that pays a 15 percent capital gains tax, why don't we make everybody's tax 15 percent? Everybody in America ought to have some financial interest in seeing this government is accountable. That's what should happen.

Instead, at pages 134 and 135 of his bill—and, again, it has to be filed in the House because it's a revenue-raising bill and under the Constitution he'll have to start here—it's not on file. There hasn't been one Democrat willing to file this disaster of a bill that the President is out there beating us up over. Actually, he's just saying pass the American Jobs Act, which is my two-page bill that really will create jobs.

□ 1110

But people need to know, Madam Speaker, that the definition in here apparently of a millionaire and billionaire is anybody who's married and makes over \$125,000 a year. For some of us, \$125,000 a year is not a millionaire or billionaire or gazillionaire. This is somebody who is paying taxes. They're paying their fair share. They're paying over 30 percent of their income in taxes. Well, why shouldn't we just say, all right, ultra-rich like Warren Buffett, quit fighting not to pay the billions of dollars you already owe in taxes, just write the check.

I think if people will go read the President's bill, they will find out we need to pass the American Jobs Act that's on file with the House. That's my bill.

REPEAL 3 PERCENT WITHHOLDING PROVISION

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, the 3 percent withholding provision, which will come into effect if Congress does not act, essentially forces businesses that have contracts with the government to forgo 3 percent of their payments as a downpayment on their tax bill. This represents yet another burden on our Nation's small businesses and job creators, the lifeblood of our economy.

As a small businessman, I know firsthand about the negative impact of burdensome taxes and cumbersome regula-

tions. Many small businesses that contract with the government operate on very slim profit margins, so a 3 percent tax would create serious cash flow problems for them at a time when so many are struggling. Aside from that, this provision will actually cost the government money. Federal, State, and local governments are already facing unprecedented deficits, and yet agencies will have to create new collection systems and may face higher costs for goods and services if this is not repealed. The Department of Defense has said that for the DOD alone, the provision will cost \$17 billion to implement. Madam Speaker, that is \$7 billion more than the total revenue the tax is expected to raise. In another example of Washington math, the provision will force the government to spend more money and end up eliminating jobs and hurting small businesses.

Congress can certainly do better. We must do better. Twenty million Americans are out of work, and our small businesses must have the certainty they need to create more jobs. We cannot punish law-abiding businesses because a few contractors do not pay their taxes. Instead, the government should stop awarding government contracts to businesses that do not pay. To that point, the OMB and the Treasury Department have announced several initiatives to prevent contracts from going to companies that are delinquent on their taxes.

Madam Speaker, we're looking for something we can do right now to help job creation in America. Well, this is it. Repealing the 3 percent withholding provision will provide a significant benefit to small businesses just by getting Washington out of their way. If we don't repeal it, we will put small businesses, jobs across America, and our efforts at economic recovery at greater risk. It's time to get this harmful job-killing provision off the books forever.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Once again we come to ask You for wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House. At a time when once again

strong sentiments stand in opposition, we ask discernment for the Members that they might judge anew their adherence to principle, conviction, and commitment.

Protect them from a deafness toward one another, lest they slide uncharitably toward an inability to work together to solve the important issues of our day.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution which might call for compromise, even sacrifice, on both sides.

In the end, may we all, as Americans, be proud of the processes of elective, democratic government.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LONG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 103(c) of Public Law 108-83, the Speaker appoints Janice C. Robinson as Director of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 633. An act to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

The message also announced that pursuant to provisions of Public Law 107-306, as amended by Public Law 111-259, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, and after consultation with the Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, announces the appointment of the Senator from Indi-

ana (Mr. COATS) to serve as a member of the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 1-minute requests on each side.

NO NEW TAXES

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I'm new to this House. I'm new to politics, actually. I'm a small business owner. I ran my own business for 30 years. And when you have your own business, you get a lot of free, unsolicited advice, and most of that advice is telling you how to run your business.

Back home, a fellow would tell you, after his 30-minute dissertation on how to run your business, he'd stop and revise and extend his remarks by saying, "Well, I guess I can run everybody's business but my own." Because usually they've been bankrupt a couple of times and been fired, but they want to tell you how to run your business.

When I hear the United States government say, "We need to create jobs, we need to tell the job creators how to operate, what to do," I'm reminded of the fellow back home who says I can run everybody's business but my own. Because we haven't had a budget in this country in over 850 days.

We don't do much right up here, and trying to run businesses is not something we should be doing. We should be reducing taxes, reducing spending, reducing regulation. And we need to get those three free trade agreements from the White House over here. If you don't believe me, ask the European Union. Car exports up over 200 percent after they signed their free trade agreement with Korea. Their aircraft is the same. It's up over 2,300 percent.

LONG-TERM INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, last week we passed a bill to extend funding for critical highway and transit infrastructure projects for 6 months. I don't think 6 months is long enough.

We're told by businesses that they need certainty before they can invest, and the same is true for those businesses that would help us build an infrastructure that reflects the challenges of the 21st century. To give that certainty, we need to pass a long-term highway and transit funding bill now so we can create lasting jobs.

In my home city of Los Angeles, we're already pursuing innovative

measures like the 30/10, America Fast Forward initiative to get the infrastructure we need to stay competitive tomorrow built today. That initiative promises to create 160,000 jobs in my area alone. Just think of what that good program could do for our country as a whole.

A long-term bill will put us one step closer to realizing that goal.

Keeping our Nation competitive in the future requires vision and boldness in the present, and I urge my colleagues to pass a long-term surface transportation bill equal to the opportunity before us.

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor one of our former colleagues, a woman who is really an institution in south Florida, in Florida, and in the Nation, and that is, of course, Congresswoman Carrie Meek.

She was the first African American elected to the Florida Senate in 1982, and then along with two other colleagues became the first African American to be elected from Florida to the U.S. Congress since Reconstruction.

But here is what I know and remember about Carrie Meek. She is the consummate stateswoman. She is a person who loves her country. She loves this institution. It doesn't matter what party you're from. Whenever you have a need, whenever you have an issue, when you want counsel, she's the person that to this day we continue to go to.

So today again, Madam Speaker, I'm here to honor a great woman, a great stateswoman, a person who in the State of Florida is revered by Republicans and Democrats alike. Her son followed her into Congress, Kendrick Meek, and he did a wonderful job, and also comes from that great tree that is Carrie Meek.

Again, I'm here to honor Carrie Meek. Carrie, we love you, we miss you, we honor you.

HONORING THE PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. FARR. I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps, and today over a thousand returned Peace Corps volunteers are here in our Capitol to bring us the attention that the Peace Corps deserves.

Congress passed legislation authorizing the Peace Corps and giving it a mandate to "promote peace and friendship."

Since then, 200,000 Americans, including myself and Congress Members TOM PETRI, MIKE HONDA, and JOHN GARAMENDI have served our great country in the name of peace and friendship.

I am so proud that 18 volunteers currently are serving from my district in California. They include Jonathan Cotham from Monterey. He's producing 500 environmental educational books in El Salvador, which will help 6,300 folks in local schools; Joshua Twisselman from Salinas. He's teaching English in Madagascar and has an English language radio station.

Just now there are 8,655 Americans currently serving in 80 countries. But Peace Corps service doesn't end when you leave the country. This weekend, more than 1,300 Peace Corps volunteers are here in Washington, D.C. They are the advocates for peace and prosperity and goodwill that the Peace Corps embodies.

Join me in making the 50th anniversary of the Peace Corps truly an opportunity to serve our country.

CREATING ECONOMIC CERTAINTY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, solving this Nation's crushing unemployment problem has been my focus since the people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me to Washington to start the process of change.

Today I rise to outline five specific actions we must accomplish to create economic certainty, give job creators the confidence they need to begin hiring again, and make American companies more competitive both here at home and globally.

They are: require the Federal Government to balance its budget annually; scrap the current Federal Tax Code and implement a flatter, fairer tax code; eliminate all pending Federal regulations not directly tied to public health or national security; establish a clear national energy policy; and repeal the President's health care law.

Now, I've discussed all of this with countless residents of eastern and southeastern Ohio, and they all like what they hear. But the popularity of this agenda has little to do with me. These ideas are rooted in the American dream, and they can boost America's economy and lead to real job creation.

If this administration wants to help us, we can start creating the jobs Ohio and America needs.

□ 1210

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I have asked some of my colleagues to join me today to pay tribute to a wonderful, wonderful stateswoman who represented Florida's 17th Congressional District for more than a decade—Congresswoman Carrie Pittman Meek. It is my present district. As a part of the Congressional

Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference, her colleagues are honoring her today for her distinguished service to greater Miami, to Florida, and to this Nation.

In Congress, she focused on issues near and dear to her heart and to those of her constituents, including economic development, education, affordable housing, and issues affecting Haiti and Haitian Americans.

The Miami-Dade County community has shown its appreciation to her by naming an elementary school, a health clinic, a boulevard, a branch of a local college, and a community center in her honor.

Congresswoman Meek once said, "Service is the price you pay for the space which God has let you occupy." I cannot think of someone who embodies this principle more than she.

Thank you, Carrie Pittman Meek, for standing up for all of us, and we are all standing on your shoulders.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MICHAEL COLE

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

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Michael Cole, a distinguished New Jersey resident who died over the weekend and whose funeral will be held tomorrow in Morristown, Morris County.

Michael was among New Jersey's distinguished lawyers and public servants. He served as Governor Thomas Kaine's chief counsel in the 1980s and was very active in heading the board of the New Jersey Legal Services Corporation. Michael was a mentor to more than a generation of New Jersey lawyers, including me when I worked under his leadership in Governor Kaine's administration.

Michael leaves his wife, Jaynee LaVecchia, a member of our State's highest tribunal, the New Jersey Supreme Court, as well as a daughter, Elyse, and a son-in-law and granddaughter.

The State of New Jersey has been enriched enormously by the life of Michael Cole. My wife, Heidi, and I mourn his loss, but join countless New Jerseyans in celebrating his wonderful life.

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank Congresswoman WILSON for bringing us together today to honor a truly exceptional public servant and friend, Congresswoman Carrie Meek.

Carrie Meek's record of accomplishments is truly too long to list, but her unique commitment to fighting for our most vulnerable communities is unmatched. Of course, there is no bigger supporter and protector of Medicare,

Medicaid, and Social Security than Congresswoman Meek, who was a member of the Appropriations Committee; and she actually counseled me to seek a slot on that committee.

So, today, we say thank you for fighting the good fight, and we applaud all of your service and your work, Carrie. Now, in this new chapter of your life, our young people continue to benefit from your wisdom through your foundation, which really deserves all of our support.

Carrie was a friend of my mentor's, our beloved Shirley Chisholm. I miss sharing our memories of Shirley Chisholm, and I also remember so much wise counsel that Carrie gave to me. I remember her sound guidance and also her principled stance. Today, I join in celebrating the many ways in which her work and her spirit have contributed to the success and well-being of countless, countless people throughout south Florida, our country, and our world.

I miss you, Carrie. I miss you especially during this Congressional Black Caucus ALC weekend. I miss your congressional classrooms. We love you. Thank you so much for your leadership. Believe you me, all of us are better people as a result of your being here for so long and for your continuing to fight the good fight for our seniors and for our children.

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in their friendly comments about our former colleague from Florida, Carrie Meek.

I first met Carrie when I was representing her brother, who was a retired military veteran and a highly decorated veteran. That relationship ended when we laid him to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. We really got to know each other well when I had the privilege of chairing the Appropriations Committee, and Carrie was a really great member of that Appropriations Committee. I remember, in some of the very tense moments which happened on occasion, she would always find some way to bring a little bit of light and a little bit of pleasure to relieve the tension that was there.

We talked often. I would say Carrie, Why is it that I can never get you to vote right?

And she would say, You know, Chairman, I've been wondering the same thing about you, why I can never get you to vote right.

We had this great relationship. I miss her serving here because she brought a lot to the House. She brought a lot to the committee.

Carrie, like your other colleagues have mentioned, we really love you; and we really appreciate and respect your service to our great Nation.

THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT AND THE END OF "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the end this week of Don't Ask, Don't Tell shows us that we have nothing to fear and can only gain by extending liberty and equality to all of our citizens. Brave young men and women will not be denied the opportunity to serve their country, and soldiers will be judged on their ability to do their jobs, not on their sexual orientation.

This is a great step forward, but some seem eager to step back. In North Carolina, there is a ballot initiative to amend the State constitution to ban same-sex marriage. This seems to be more about turning out the Republican political base than about marriage, and many of our businesses say it would hinder their attempts to treat employees fairly. We must defeat it.

At the national level, we also have an anachronistic law, the so-called Defense of Marriage Act. This should be repealed. Repeal would ensure that marriages entered into in one State will be recognized by other States. This year, I have again cosponsored repeal and don't intend to rest until DOMA is erased from the U.S. Code.

Madam Speaker, history will judge these efforts at discrimination harshly. It is time for America's political leaders, including Members of this body, to catch up.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, if our Nation's debt crisis has taught us anything, it's that we need a permanent fiscal solution to keep America the permanent land of the free for our children and grandchildren.

There is only one way to bind Congress to such a commitment, and that is a constitutional amendment requiring us to balance the budget. Ordinary spending cuts and pledges to slash the deficit are no longer sufficient.

Washington went on a record-breaking spending binge and left Americans in an economic hangover. New taxes, as some propose, would only punish the victim and reward the spenders with more money to waste. We need to stop spending money we don't have and begin living within our means. The future of our Nation depends on it.

A Washington promise is always temporary. A constitutional amendment is permanent. For the sake of tomorrow's generations, let's get it done today.

□ 1220

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary woman, a dedicated public servant, and a dear friend: Congresswoman Carrie Meek. Carrie has lived a life of distinction, and her legacy is extensive and incredible.

The granddaughter of a slave, Carrie became the first African American woman to serve in the Florida Senate. My husband, Dexter Lehtinen, and I had the honor of serving with Carrie in the Florida House and then in the Florida Senate, and then Carrie went on to become the first African American from Florida since Reconstruction elected to Congress. What an honor.

While in Congress, Carrie worked vigorously and resolutely for her constituents in all of south Florida, playing an instrumental role in rebuilding our community after the devastation of Hurricane Andrew.

Her accomplishments and service to our south Florida community are too many to be enumerated; however, she hasn't rested on her laurels. Since leaving this Chamber, she continues her commitment to service through The Carrie Meek Foundation.

I ask my colleagues to join us today in paying tribute to our dear friend, Congresswoman Carrie Meek.

JOBS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, we each talk in this Chamber about jobs. The good news is legislation that will create jobs has already been introduced. Now we have to pass it.

The American Jobs Act includes \$50 billion to repair our aging infrastructure. It would create 3,100 jobs in western New York, alone, rebuilding our roads and bridges, which will encourage private development and even further job creation. Economists have concluded that this bill will create 2 million jobs and keep the U.S. from sliding back into recession.

Also, Madam Speaker, according to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, 2.8 million jobs have been lost over the last decade as a result of our trade deficit with China, including 22,000 jobs in western New York, alone. American workers can compete with anyone so long as there is a level playing field, but China is fixing the game through currency manipulation. The Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act would put a stop to that.

The time is long past due for this Congress to pass legislation that will create jobs. I urge the House to take up the American Jobs Act and the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act immediately.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(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. Madam Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I rise today to reaffirm my deep and unwavering commitment to the State of Israel, our greatest friend and closest ally in the Middle East.

This is a country that has celebrated our triumphs and mourned our tragedies, a country that has shared our principles of peace, freedom, and democracy, and, most of all, a country that has, without fail, defended America in her darkest hour.

As the U.N. considers recognizing an independent Palestinian state, it is more important now than ever that we stand up, speak out, and oppose this blatant attempt to circumvent direct talks with Israel. I've joined with many other colleagues in a letter to President Obama urging the U.N. to veto any resolution that grants the Palestinian statehood without direct negotiation with Israel.

Peace cannot be created or sustained through a single unilateral decision from the U.N. I will continue to urge the U.N. to veto, and I will stand with tremendous pride and admiration beside our friends in Israel.

TRAIN ACT—REPUBLICANS' SO-CALLED JOBS BILL

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

Ms. CHU. Some in Congress want to use the jobs crisis as an excuse to roll back clean air protections that have prevented 200,000 premature deaths.

Today we are debating the TRAIN Act. This is the Republicans' so-called jobs bill, conducting studies that will do nothing but add paper to landfills instead of creating jobs by upgrading toxic power plants so that they are no longer a threat to public health.

The studies have been done. Americans are still breathing mercury, arsenic, and chromium, and we have a means to clean it up. It's called the Clean Air Act, and it was passed in 1963.

No matter what anyone says, increased pollution is not a sustainable path to job creation. Instead, we should be saving lives, saving our environment, and investing in the clean tech jobs of the future.

The TRAIN Act is a train wreck for Americans.

JOBS

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, few come to this Congress with more interest in protecting air and water than myself, as I did as a prosecutor who actually used the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act for the good of the country. We must find balance.

Madam Speaker, I am here today because I woke up this morning with the thought of steelworkers on my mind, some of the 1,500 steelworkers whose jobs are now at risk since the Sun Oil Refinery announced last week that it is getting out of the refining business—in essence, the inability to compete because of the overregulation that we have—and these jobs are going to be shipped overseas.

Good union-paying American jobs that could be here, because of the policies that are coming out of Washington, are being destroyed and sent overseas. It is counterintuitive; it is counterproductive. We must use common sense.

We can't let the rhetoric stand in the way of reality. We must fight for the future of those jobs while we fight for clean air.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, the President has offered a clear path forward to put the country back to work, help small business succeed and hire, provide tax relief for our workers, and rebuild America.

The American Jobs Act will provide an immediate boost to our economy through job creation and tax relief for American workers and businesses. Specifically, this plan will prevent teacher layoffs and keep firefighters and police officers on the job.

It will support the modernization of at least 35,000 public schools across the country to ensure that every student has access to a 21st century education. This plan will create even more jobs by investing in America's crumbling infrastructure by rebuilding our roads, rebuilding our railways, and rebuilding our airports.

Finally, the American Jobs Act will cut payroll taxes in half for at least 160 million workers next year, allow more Americans to refinance their homes at today's near 4 percent interest rates, and provide incentives for employers to hire long-term unemployed workers.

Madam Speaker, Americans across this country are counting on this Congress to swiftly act to create jobs and rebuild our economy.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, when the health care bill known as ObamaCare was being debated in this Congress, Republicans said the bill would bankrupt our country, ration care for seniors, and cost Americans jobs.

Well, that's exactly what will be happening if the new provision of the law goes into effect next week. Unelected

Washington bureaucrats have ignored calls from Congress asking for a delay in Medicare cuts to skilled nursing facilities and rehab centers.

My colleagues know that I have a reputation for being one of the more fiscally conservative Members of Congress. I understand the need for cuts. But as one medical professional recently said: "If I'm told I need an amputation, I'd like to know what limb is being cut off."

The administration is proposing a reckless cut of nearly 13 percent to skilled nursing facilities and rehab centers. Eighty percent of the overhead at these facilities is staffed, meaning the people who take care of our seniors will be the first to lose their jobs. Receiving a lower quality of care at rehab centers means there's a greater chance that patients will spend more time at a costly hospital, resulting in higher overall costs.

Madam Speaker, this isn't common sense. This policy isn't thinking smart. Our seniors deserve better, and I strongly urge the administration to reconsider their position.

□ 1230

ARTIFICIAL PANCREAS TO HELP TREAT DIABETES

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the artificial pancreas, which will transform the way we treat diabetes in our country. Millions of Americans have diabetes. Diabetes accounts for approximately \$174 billion in health care costs in the U.S. each year, 32 percent of our Medicare expenditures.

Studies show that tight control of blood glucose levels significantly reduces or delays the development of diabetic complications. Most patients with diabetes cannot achieve tight glucose control with traditional diabetes tools. Erratic blood glucose levels can cause devastating complications, including kidney failure, blindness, nerve damage, amputations, heart attack, and stroke.

The artificial pancreas can allow individuals suffering from diabetes to regulate their blood glucose levels using an insulin pump and a sensor. The system can prevent low and high glucose levels and help individuals with diabetes avoid the worst and most costly complications while allowing them to remain healthy until a cure is found.

In April of this year, 250 Members of the House, myself included, and 60 Senators sent a letter to the FDA urging them to approve the artificial pancreas. I am encouraged by FDA's response to have a decision by December.

END BURDENSOME REGULATIONS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, since this year began, the United States House has put forth measure after measure to incentivize growth and end burdensome regulations, only to see them stall in the Senate and be ignored by the President.

Two years after passage of the stimulus, unemployment remains at staggering levels, despite billions of dollars still sitting in government coffers. It was my hope that the President would move past his stimulus spending proposals and offer real economic relief. While some of the President's proposals put forward in his Joint Session speech merit consideration, this bill is no substitute for the targeted, long-term policies needed to empower private sector investment by facilitating an economic climate where businesses have the confidence to hire workers and take on new endeavors.

We're not talking about real, pro-growth tax reform and regulatory relief because it sounds good. It's what our economy needs, and badly.

It's time for Congress—both Chambers—and the President to recognize the pressing need for real tax relief and aggressive regulatory reform. It's time for a new direction, and it's time for action.

PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the President for the American Jobs Act. This bill gets squarely behind the program of putting our country back to work and rebuilding the Nation.

As you go around and you talk to people, Americans understand implicitly that we have to rebuild this country and make it strong. That means a lot of things, but, first and foremost, it means investing in our infrastructure, rebuilding our bridges, tunnels, and highways; and this bill would put resources towards that task, investing in human capital, education, innovation, technology, entrepreneurship. This bill would make sure that teachers go back to work so they can teach our young people in the classroom, investing in strong communities.

This bill would support resources for our firefighters, put more police officers out there on the beat. That's investing in communities. We have to rebuild this country. The American Jobs Act does that. Let's pass the American Jobs Act, put this country back to work.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MATT BRUNO

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

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, this past weekend, California's central valley lost a great leader, a leader in the dairy construction field, a man that has been a supporter to many community causes, such as the Education Foundation of Stanislaus County, Center for Human Services, and the Memorial Hospital Foundation.

Matt Bruno owned and operated Turlock Dairy & Refrigeration, which employed 65 employees. He played a key role in the expansion of dairy farming in the area. His family grew peaches, almonds, and grapes, and he still continued that tradition on the farm where he was raised.

He graduated from Ripon High School, was very active in real estate investing and commercial properties, and in 1972 he bought Turlock Refrigeration Center. A year later, he bought Turlock-based Miller Dairy Supply, and the two companies were merged in 1974.

Matt Bruno is survived by his wife, Barbara; sons, Tony and Matt; three grandchildren; brother, Ed Bruno of Ripon; and sister, Vickie Maselis of Modesto.

On this day, the House of Representatives will celebrate his life.

WAR ON THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, Republican leaders have made the laughable accusation that the President is engaging in class warfare. What President Obama is actually doing is ending class warfare, the relentless war on the middle class. Since 1983, over 80 percent of the growth in income has gone to the richest 5 percent of Americans, while the bottom 60 percent has lost 7.5 percent in income, of real income. That's the majority of Americans that are doing worse.

When I was growing up, a family could live a middle class life on one good job, often a good union job, public or private sector, with health benefits and a pension. That was the normal. Seems like the new normal in America, the one that I see the Republicans promoting is the rich get richer, the middle class is disappearing, and the poor get even poorer.

We need to enact bold laws like the President's American Jobs Act and common sense and fair budget proposals, both of which would help restore the middle class, protect the poor, and keep America strong.

UNLEASH THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, our Nation is faced with 10 percent unemployment and rising, out-of-control deficits. And the Obama administration solution: spend more, tax more, and regulate more. This has created an environment that has destroyed confidence and increased unemployment.

Instead, Washington must create an environment favorable to job creation. We must rein in out-of-control spending. This fall, we will vote on a balanced budget amendment that will require Washington to do what families and small businesses already do: live within their means. We must remain focused on relieving the regulations that are choking job creation. And lastly, we must concentrate on tax reform, not tax increases, because increased taxes are the enemy of job creation.

The American people don't want more solutions from the Federal Government; they want the Federal Government to get out of the way. And if we do those things, we will unleash the American economy and give businesses the confidence they need to grow and to create jobs.

WE'RE LOSING OUR MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, corporate profits have now reached historically high levels—\$2 trillion just in the last two quarters. But most of that profit comes from reductions in personnel and benefit costs which are at a 50-year low as a percent of our economy. This is one of the reasons why the richest 1 percent earn as much as the bottom 60 percent and have as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent of Americans. Tax cuts for the richest, as the House majority demands, is only going to widen this historic disparity. The President's Jobs Act, though, will help to close this gap.

Madam Speaker, we're losing our middle class. Our country is becoming divided between the very rich and the rest. That may be good for the financial base of the Republican Party, but it's bad for America. The private sector will start to hire when the public sector shows it has sufficient faith in our future to adequately invest in the physical and the human infrastructure of this country. It takes money, but the future of our middle class is worth it.

JOB CREATION AND GROWTH

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, the American people want to be in the business of job creation and growth. Unfortunately, Washington is in the business of regulating, spending, and taxing.

This administration has barreled down the road of massive deficits, historic debt, and ridiculous mandates. We all know where that road leads—right off a cliff.

Job creators know that our \$14.6 trillion debt is a tax on the American taxpayer. They know that higher taxes mean fewer jobs. And they know that focusing on compliance rather than innovation is a failing business model.

But in the face of these difficult times, Americans are optimistic. Not even the worst unemployment since the Great Depression can kill the American spirit. Washington can give job creators confidence by living within its means and reining in the regulatory machine. The American drive to succeed will take care of the rest.

Job creators are ready for real growth, not another failed stimulus. Let's pass a balanced budget amendment to require Washington to use common sense, just like Americans do.

□ 1240

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we love you, Carrie Meek. And I am delighted to rise today to admit that Carrie Meek, Congresswoman Meek, was a mentor to me and someone who drew the admiration of Republicans and Democrats and did some unique and remarkable activities here in this Congress.

One, as a freshman, she pushed enough to become a member of the Appropriations Committee and led graciously during her tenure. And then she worked very closely with Republicans and Democrats to fight to ensure that cigarette packages had warnings about the impact—the negative impact—on groups like African Americans.

Carrie, do you remember the picture that we took with Rosa Parks and some of our colleagues, and how gracious you were? And do you remember the 25,000 people in Florida when they were trying to overturn affirmative action? And yes, you walked as long and as hard as anybody else.

So, Carrie, I think the jobs bill that the President has could be named after you, where it provides some 80 percent compensation to small businesses to hire people. That sounds like Carrie Meek. And I think we can resolve the CR and provide for those who have suffered disasters and do the right thing. That sounds like Carrie Meek. So I'm here to pay tribute to our friend, Carrie Meek, and to thank her for sending her son, Kendrick, who is a great

friend, and to let you know that we need to follow in the pathway of Carrie Meek that brings us all together to pass the jobs bill, a bill that could really be named after you Carrie, and as well to ensure that we protect those who have been harmed by disasters.

Thank you, Congresswoman Carrie Meek.

BARRIERS TO JOB CREATION

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, this House and this Congress need to be focused on job creation. In fact, this House has passed scores of legislation out of the House over to the Senate that would create millions of American jobs. Yet the Senate refuses to take any action on them.

And what do we get from the President? We get more of the same class warfare and failed stimulus legislation. Of course, his first stimulus was such a disaster. We had a hearing last week that exposed the Solyndra scandal. That's the company that the President used as the poster child for the stimulus bill 2 years ago. And what happened? The taxpayers are on the hook right now for over \$530 million of money that was thrown away by this company that the President called a year ago the "future of this country."

Well, I don't want a future of bankruptcy, I don't want a future of scandal, and I don't want a future of the radical regulations and this class warfare that this President has given to this country. We need to create American jobs. We need to get these crazy regulations off the backs of our small business owners and create jobs in America.

WE LOVE OUR CARRIE MEEK

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank FREDERICA WILSON for organizing the "We Love Our Carrie Meek" 1-minutes.

Carrie, I want to make sure that you understand that this is not funereal, and they've kind of made it sound that way. This is a tribute to you. And since you and I came here together, along with JIM CLYBURN, CORRINE BROWN, SANFORD BISHOP and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and BENNIE THOMPSON half-way, since he came a little bit later, I speak for them as well.

EDDIE BERNICE could not be here but asked that I recite a portion of her remarks, and that is that your career in the House was distinguished as well as that on the State level.

Almost immediately, the Congresswoman established herself as a champion of expanding federal programs to create jobs and provide initiatives for African American business owners. In a

battle that is still being fought today, Congresswoman Meek passionately opposed cuts to social welfare programs in the 1990s to prevent the financial burden from being carried on the backs of the middle class and the disadvantaged.

I have the distinction of offering EDDIE BERNICE's full remarks and the compliments and congratulations from all of our class that came here in 1992, and an even greater distinction of speaking with Carrie perhaps as much or more than most of the Members with regularity and sharing with her the number of jokes and a number of anecdotes that we have together.

I, as well as all of us, are proud of you, Carrie, and the enormous work that you have done and that you will continue to do through the foundation. And thanks again for sending Kendrick to us as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks through the Chair.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2401, TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 406 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 406

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2401, the Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation. Fortunately, the anagram comes to TRAIN, so it's the TRAIN Act of 2011.

It makes in order 12 specific amendments out of the 14 that were received by the Rules Committee. Of the two not made in order, one was withdrawn by the sponsor and the other was not germane to the rules of the House. So what the Rules Committee has presented here is a rule that is, quite frankly, not bad. It is going to provide for an open discussion for those who are interested in this particular issue on the floor. It's a very fair rule, and it continues the record of the Rules Committee in this Congress of making as many amendments in order as possible which simply conform to the rules of the House. That's been the goal of our chairman, Mr. DREIER, and say what you will, he has produced a standard of fairness in the floor discussions that we will be having here on the floor in the past as well as in the future.

There are a lot of people that say Congress is simply dysfunctional. I admit, the system was designed to be complex, but there are a lot of people, especially those that have very little contact with this system, who simply stand up and say, why can't you just

reach across the aisle, find some compromise, and work in a bipartisan manner? To those people who are continually asking for that, you got it. It's here today in this particular bill.

The discussion draft of this bill was a bipartisan bill with a Republican and Democrat sponsor. First hearings on this bill were done back in April, so they have done their due diligence in studying the issue and working the bill to the point that they actually scrapped the first bill and reintroduced another, and once again, with bipartisan sponsorship of the bill.

□ 1250

If you look at the cosponsors on this bill, you will find Republicans and Democrats. Even in the final vote in committee, one Republican voted against it, and 29 percent of the Democrats actually voted for it. This is a process to be envied. If you want a good system, a bill that comes through in a bipartisan manner, this is it.

We all know that business is impacted by both legislation and regulation, and sometimes the blatant disregard for the cumulative negative impacts of onerous and sometimes overlapping new rules and regulations have had a disastrous effect on industry and on jobs. The current EPA appears to be driven to regulatory excess by asserting powers or controls in an area where that power and control have never been expressly delegated to the agency by Congress.

So, Madam Speaker, while I'm sure that every Member wants to have clean air and clean water and all Americans want clean air and clean water—they are vital objectives and laudable goals—however, I also think that many would agree that some of the current issues in some areas have gone beyond what Congress ever intended or ever approved, and also far beyond common sense. It has not helped the economic health of this particular country, which is why I commend the sponsors, both sides of the aisle, who recognize this problem and have come up with this legislation to fix the problem.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2401, simply says to the EPA—and potentially other agencies—stop, slow down. Take a more careful look at what you're doing or proposing to do. Take a serious and methodical look at whether or not what you're doing is duplicative of rules and regulations already on the books, whether or not they are overlapping, confusing, or contradictory rules and regulations to those already on the books. It tells them to do an analysis of alternative strategies that may be used to avoid damage to our fragile environment as well as our fragile economy.

This bill tells EPA—and others—that before certain draft regulations go into effect, it actually needs to study and consider the cumulative impacts of these new rules and regulations on energy production, on costs, on jobs, and on our Nation's global competitiveness.

Imagine that. Imagine a Federal agency seeking to institute rules and regulations which actually took the time to study the impacts of those plans and rules and regulations first. Who could oppose such a concept? It is just common sense.

There will be some that will complain, when the bill is discussed on the floor—maybe even here on the rule itself—that this goal is to dismantle the EPA and dismantle other organizations. No programs are cut by this process. Nothing is changed by this process. Some will stand up and say it's going to be a biased study. There are no limits to what the agencies can study. What this bill simply does is it makes sure that what has been ignored in the past is no longer ignored.

Are there some specific things that have to be considered? Yes, that's right, because we specifically identify what has been ignored. There is nothing in this bill that forbids any rules or regulations. It just says to the agencies, for heaven's sake, get the facts first.

This bill holds the executive branch agencies accountable and forces them to be reasonable and actually study what they're doing before they implement it.

This is a good bill, it is a very good rule, and I would urge adoption of both. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2401. I do thank my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, for granting the time for the opposition.

This bill is really another attempt by the Republican leadership to demonize the Environmental Protection Agency and dismantle any government regulation intended to protect our Nation's public health and the environment.

H.R. 2401 is a waste of time and an absolute insult to the millions of Americans without jobs. Instead of crafting legislation to increase consumer confidence, instead of helping Americans hold on to their homes, instead of creating jobs for the millions of people who are unemployed, instead of relieving the burden of the middle class by making the Tax Code more fair, my friends on the other side are asking us to vote on a bill that effectively bars the EPA from finalizing and implementing two of the most significant air quality regulations in decades.

Coal plants—and let me lay my bonafides out here: I do believe in clean coal—the biggest source of unregulated mercury emissions in the United States, pump out 48 tons of emissions every year. Mercury contaminates more than 6 million acres of freshwater lakes, and I want to just take the prerogative of talking about one.

I was born in Altamonte Springs, Florida, and the nearest lake to where I was born is called Mobile. At one point, my grandfather could pass by and say to my grandmother, I'm going down to the lake and catch some fish—and be guaranteed that that was going

to be the case—and bring it back home in short time.

Now that lake is dead, and it's because of mercury contamination that that lake is dead; 46,000 miles of streams, and the stream that led into Lake Mobile is dead. And 225,000 acres of wetlands across the United States in all 50 States have some type of fish consumption advisory. Let me repeat that: all 50 States have some type of fish consumption advisory.

What's more, there are substantial economic benefits to these clean air rules that my friends are trying to block. The EPA estimates that the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards alone could generate more than 30,000 construction jobs and 9,000 long-term utility jobs, benefiting steelmakers, pipefitters, boilermakers, and others.

The economic value of air quality improvements totals \$59 billion to \$140 billion annually. That's 25,300 lives lost to toxic air pollution; over 11,000 heart attacks; more than 12,000 asthma attacks, and a significant portion of them being children; over 12,200 additional visits to the emergency rooms of our country; and hundreds of thousands of missed work days.

Overall, the EPA predicts that the monetary value of protecting Americans' health through implementing the Clean Air Act is projected to reach \$2 trillion in 2020 alone. Yet this bill ignores those benefits.

Madam Speaker, all of us know that times are tough, but this great Nation has been through tough economic times before. Environmental regulations are not the problem. The economy was really tough—and we are reminded of it often by my colleagues—under President Carter; yet the EPA at the time managed to set new national air pollution standards for airborne lead and began the phaseout of ozone-layer-destroying gases from aerosol spray products.

Nor has protecting the environment always been a partisan issue. The EPA has also had great successes under Republican Presidents. Upon founding the EPA in 1970, President Richard Nixon said the following: "We can no longer afford to consider air and water common property, free to be abused by anyone without regard to the consequences. Instead, we should begin now to treat them as scarce resources which we are no more free to contaminate than we are free to throw garbage into our neighbor's yard." That was in 1970.

One of the first tasks assigned to the EPA was to enforce the Clean Air Act, also signed by President Nixon. Since its adoption, these regulations have prevented an estimated 200,000 premature deaths.

□ 1300

During President Reagan's administration, the EPA tested elementary and secondary schools for asbestos for the first time and named protecting endangered wetlands a top priority, while

subsequently opening the new Office of Wetlands Protection.

And contrary to what many of my friends across the aisle believe, history did not end with President Reagan. President George H.W. Bush implemented the new cap-and-trade policies that successfully addressed the growing problem of acid rain.

President Bush's EPA also started the wildly successful Energy Star program, helping Americans save money through adopting energy-efficient products and practices. Since then, Energy Star has saved Americans \$17 billion on utility bills.

And on a more personal level, I grew up at times with asthma, as did a cousin of mine who still suffers the effects of it. Several of the employees that work with me now and some before have had asthma, and I genuinely believe that if we did not have the clean air standards that we have today, some of us may not be here.

In light of all these accomplishments, it's clear that H.R. 2041 is nothing more than an effort, at the behest of a big, big set of businesses, to delay and block necessary and important regulations that will keep our country safe and clean.

Republicans claim that this bill assists agencies with their economic analyses of EPA regulations. This is nothing more than a convenient, ad hoc justification.

Firstly, all major regulations already receive years of extensive cost-benefit analysis before implementation. At the same time, this bill fails to take into account any of the health and environmental benefits of the regulations in question, rendering the one-sided "cost-only" analysis set forth by this bill unnecessary.

Second, the version of the Energy and Commerce bill that was reported out suspends two major regulations that have been the subject of analysis, litigation, re-examination and rewriting for over two decades. Both the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive order 12866 signed by President Clinton require Federal agencies to perform the type of analysis required in the bill, including a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis.

By requiring unnecessary and duplicative studies, my friends on the other side could not make their desire to indefinitely block these regulations any more clear.

I've introduced an amendment that carves out an exception for rules and regulations drafted in adherence to the rules already on the books, freeing these important regulations to proceed along as scheduled.

Madam Speaker, based on what I've seen by this Republican-led Congress, it's clear to me that they obviously have no intention of using their real power to create jobs. Instead, they prefer to waste time on measures such as this bill that are designed to do one simple thing, and that is to further delay both past and future regulations.

Now, let me make it clear. I've quarreled, as have some of my colleagues, with the Environmental Protection Agency, as rightly we should when the circumstances permit, and that is, in my case, with the numeric nutrient standards that are proposed in Florida. A court has made a decision regarding the enforcement of those nutrient standards, and I believe that the communities involved are prepared to undertake to do what's necessary. And I do not believe that EPA has to involve itself at this point in time.

But when I quarrel with EPA, as I do, I don't do it in a way that demonizes the agency. I do it in a way that's looking for a solution.

One thing that I've learned in the years that I've been in this institution is that whether you have a right or left or center ideological perspective, to begin demonizing certain people suggests to me that those people probably have been successful. I don't know Lisa Jackson, the Environmental Protection Agency Cabinet official, but I do know that the way people are screaming about the work that she has done suggests that she must be having some success.

It's time to call my friends out on the other side for their shenanigans, and show the American people that they are more interested in helping big business and the wealthy than the middle class and working poor Americans who continue to struggle all across this Nation every single day.

If we start cutting the regulations that protect the environment when we are down, where will we be when we recover?

I've seen firsthand what happens in places that disregard environmental protections for the sake of business. I remember being in Seong, China with a departed colleague, Gerald Sullivan, who was chair of the Rules Committee, and holding my hand in front of my face and not being able to see it. I also had that same experience in Los Angeles, California, in the late 1950s.

This certainly is not the kind of home that we want to leave for our grandchildren. The air that we breathe, the water that we drink, the soil on which we produce our crops is the earth that we call home. And, in my view, we must keep it clean.

Let me tell you what Ronald Reagan said. If we've learned any lessons during the past few decades, perhaps the most important is that preservation of our environment is not a partisan challenge. It's common sense. Our physical health, our social happiness, and our economic well-being will be sustained only by all of us working in partnership as thoughtful, effective stewards of our natural resources. President Reagan made those remarks on signing an annual report of the Council on Environmental Quality.

Additionally, he said, in a radio address, that I'm proud of having been one of the first to recognize that States and the Federal Government have a

duty to protect our natural resources from the damaging effects of pollution that can accompany industrial development.

And more importantly, what he said is, what is conservative after all, but one who conserves, one who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live? And we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live, our countrysides, our rivers and mountains, our plains and meadows and forests. This is our patrimony. This is what we leave to our children, and our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it. He made those remarks at the dedication of the National Geographic Society's new headquarters building in 1984.

President George W. Bush said, our country, the United States, is the world's largest emitter of manmade greenhouse gases. We account for almost 20 percent of the world's manmade greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, in a joint address to Congress he said, I also call on Congress to work with my administration to achieve the significant emission reductions made possible by implementing the clean energy technologies proposed in our energy plan. Our working group study has made it clear that we need to do a lot more.

Those words from two Presidents that are revered, rightly, by many of us in this institution, and certainly by my colleagues that are Republican that share the same ideological perspectives, should be sufficient to put to rest this polluting bill that we could rename the Toxic Polluting America measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman for not demonizing me or my colleagues and our motives on this bill.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'll try to do better about that as we progress.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, a former member of the Rules Committee, a distinguished Member of this body from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague from Florida for his eloquent words and for allowing me a moment to speak on the floor.

Madam Speaker, the TRAIN Act will repeal two critical clean air standards: the proposed Mercury and Air Toxics Standards and the final Cross-State Air Pollution Rule for power plants that burn coal and oil.

I'm from the State of Maine, and Maine is the tailpipe of the Nation for most atmospheric pollution. Nearly 130,000 people in Maine have been diagnosed with asthma. Yesterday in my office, I met with a wonderful young man named Jake, one of 28,000 children in the State of Maine who suffer from

asthma. I also met with his parents, small business owners who struggle to pay more than a thousand dollars a month in insurance and medication to keep Jake healthy.

Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and decreased air pollution by 60 percent. Implementing Clean Air standards will mean fewer kids and parents will struggle with life-long costs of dirty air. Improved standards will also mean reducing the amount of mercury and toxins in the air and water.

In 2000, the government determined that major coal-burning entities are the single largest source of manmade emissions of mercury in the United States. It's estimated that 6 percent of women in the U.S. of childbearing age have dangerous levels of mercury in their blood, and more than 410,000 children born each year in the United States are exposed to levels of mercury in the womb high enough to impair neurological development.

Madam Speaker, improved Clean Air Act standards will dramatically reduce atmospheric pollution and decrease dangerous healthy effects of dirty air. The TRAIN Act would delay those standards.

Companies are prepared to meet improved Clean Air Act standards by making further investments in technology that would create over a million jobs in the United States between 2011 and 2015. The TRAIN Act will delay those investments.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. The TRAIN Act will delay those investments and delay those jobs in this country. The TRAIN Act is bad for business, it's bad for our health, and it's bad for the State of Maine. I urge a "no" vote on the TRAIN Act and a "no" vote on delaying Clean Air Act standards.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 1366, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2011.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), whose father I had the privilege of serving with as well.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question so we can bring to the floor a bipartisan bill that I reintroduced earlier this year, H.R. 1366, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act.

I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize our near-term and long-term economic challenges and understand that the American people want us to help them get back to work. So rather than consid-

ering a bill to tie up pending environmental regulations in red tape, we should be bringing to the floor a bill we can agree will improve our competitiveness and help the private sector create good jobs.

The National Manufacturing Strategy Act requires the President to establish a bipartisan public/private manufacturing strategy board. This board would analyze the various factors that affect manufacturing, including trade, taxes, regulations, among others. It would also consider the government's programs, policies, and role in promoting manufacturing and identify goals and recommendations for Federal, State, and private sector entities to pursue in order to achieve the greatest economic opportunity for manufacturers in America.

The strategy will be reexamined every 4 years so it would reflect the implementation of prior recommendations, reassess global markets and technological development, and plot a revised strategy.

The Federal Government already has significant and broad influence on the domestic environment for manufacturing; and certain areas of the government rely greatly on a strong manufacturing base, particularly our national defense. Yet there's little to unify the multitude of programs and policies that exist throughout the government toward the common goals and agenda for promoting our domestic manufacturing base and securing our place in the world's markets.

Unfortunately, the government's promotion of manufacturing has been ad hoc. Instead, we need to be proactive and organized and efficient across our government.

Most of our competitors understand the need for a strategy. Not just China and India but also Germany, Canada, the United Kingdom, among others, have developed and implemented strategies.

This idea enjoys widespread support in America from a wide range of industrial sectors, labor, and the public. A poll conducted last year by Alliance for American Manufacturing found that 86 percent of Americans favor a national manufacturing strategy aimed at getting economic, tax, labor, and trade policies working together.

This public support already has been echoed in this Chamber where last year we passed this bill by a bipartisan vote of 379–38.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in calling for action on jobs and the economy. We cannot continue to sit idly as our manufacturing base and quality, well-paying jobs depart for China, India, or elsewhere.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LIPINSKI. We must take action to provide a competitive and focused foundation for those who will continue to make it in America, and we can do

so now by defeating the previous question and then passing the National Manufacturing Strategy Act. The American public is waiting. They need jobs. They want us to act. So let's move forward together on something we can agree to and get Americans back to work.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my extraordinarily quick-witted, thoughtful and hardworking colleague from the Rules Committee for yielding me the time. I rise in strong support of this rule, and I take the floor to do my doggone-est to help us put in perspective why it is that we're here and what it is that we're doing.

Let me say that at the outset I think most everybody acknowledges if you're a job creator, that often government regulation and government control has undermined your potential to create new jobs and streamline your operation and make sure you can deliver a product or a service to a consumer at a lower price.

Let's just at the outset say that the notion of trying to tackle the issue of the overreach of government overregulating businesses and individuals is a challenge that needs to be addressed. That's really what came to the introduction by our colleague, Mr. SULLIVAN, and the very hard work done by Mr. WHITFIELD in the Energy and Commerce Committee of this so-called TRAIN Act, T-R-A-I-N. Don't ask me to say exactly what the acronym means. I'd have to read it to see it.

It basically means that we're going to have an entity put into place that's going to look at both the costs as well as the benefits for dealing with the issue of regulation.

Now, my friend from Fort Lauderdale regaled us in the Rules Committee when we were marking this up a couple of days ago about the time that he spent in Los Angeles. He told the story about awakening and not being able to open his eyes because the air pollution was so great in Los Angeles. He may have shared that with our colleagues here on the House floor as he did in the Rules Committee. I don't know. I haven't followed the debate that closely. I was in another meeting.

I will say that I live in Los Angeles today, and I represent the Los Angeles basin. I'm a Republican. I'm a Republican who likes to breathe clean air, and I'm a Republican who likes to drink safe water. I don't have as a goal, as a priority, the obliteration of air quality or water quality. It's not a priority for me, and I frankly don't know of any Democrat or Republican in this institution who has a desire to do that.

□ 1320

I am also one who recognizes that many of the things that have been done at the governmental level have played

a role in actually improving air quality and in playing a role in improving drinking water. I will say that there is no desire on the part of anyone to undermine the assurance that we have of clean air and safe drinking water.

Now, having said that, I think it's important for us to recognize that we are going to do everything that we can, though, to say when we see duplicative regulation. When we see the kind of burden that has been imposed, we should see action taken. But guess what? This committee is not empowered to do anything—anything at all—like what has been described or implied by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This committee will not be able to repeal any regulation as it relates to drinking water or clean air or any of these ideas.

I also want to say that I happen to believe that good environmental policy happens to be good business. I know there is often this sense that, if you're pro-environment, you must be anti-business, and if you're pro-business, you must be anti-environment. I see the two really going hand in hand; but it's important for us to make sure that we don't go overboard in undermining businesses' potential to address environmental needs with a regulatory burden that is as great as some have reported it to be.

To me, we have made every single amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order, so we're going to have an opportunity for a free-flowing debate with Democrats, including an amendment that the Democratic floor manager of this rule will have that has been made in order by the Rules Committee.

We're going to have an opportunity for a free-flowing debate, and I urge my colleagues to support this very commonsense measure.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague from California spoke about what our committee would do. I would urge him to understand that Congress is doing it for them with this measure.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, the day before yesterday, Frances Beinecke, the president of the Natural Resources Defense Council, said the following:

“GOP lawmakers would have us believe that the public health and environmental safeguards stemming from the Clean Air Act—a 40-year-old law signed by President Nixon—are thwarting economic growth. It's not the unregulated market in mortgage debt, the U.S. trade deficit with China, or the shaky state of European banks

that is freezing growth. It's the EPA's effort to reduce toxins from old power plants.”

Madam Speaker, millions of Americans are hurting and are in desperate need of our help. Instead of working to create jobs, my colleagues on the other side would rather consider “do nothing” bills. We've been doing nothing around here for a very long time now and have been considering “do nothing” to get our economy back on track. This “do nothing” bill does not create jobs, and it does nothing to help the struggle of middle class and working poor Americans. Let me just give some examples of the time line on the Environmental Protection Agency's laws and list them, in part, by administration.

I spoke earlier about the Clean Air Act of 1970 and the Clean Water Act that President Nixon vetoed. His veto was overridden, and then he signed it on October 18, 1972.

Under President Ford, we got the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the cancer-causing pesticides were banned. There was the Toxic Substances Control Act in 1976 under President Ford.

Under Jimmy Carter, we got the Clean Water Act of 1977. Then the EPA set a new national air pollution standard for lead, and I'm sure families with children understand that dynamic. The phaseout of chlorofluorocarbons took place in 1978.

Under President Reagan, in 1982, we got the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the asbestos testing in schools, which was critically important throughout this Nation. We got the Chesapeake Bay pollution cleanup and a 90 percent reduction of lead in gasoline. During that same period of time, although it was not his discovery, the ozone layer problem was discovered. Then in 1986, President Reagan signed the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments, the wetlands protection measure, and the Right-to-Know Laws for chemical safety. The Montreal Protocol was signed by the President in 1987 and standards for underground storage tanks in 1988. The sewage Ocean Dumping Ban also came about in 1988.

The Alar pesticide ban for use on foods came under President Bush. Toxic waste control came under President Bush as well as the Pollution Prevention Act. Acid rain controls were enacted as well as the Energy Star program.

Those are just a few, and I won't go into the many under President Clinton and the few that have taken place under President Obama.

With that said, there seems to be this act against the Environmental Protection Agency that suggests that they have been harmful in some way—that's another word for “demonize”—that they've been harmful, the EPA, in all of these things that have been done throughout all of this time that have helped our environment.

I just, for the life of me, don't understand why it is now we want to slow

down this process and allow for an analysis, that is already being done, to be delayed. We want to protect and conserve the land on which we live—our countryside, our rivers, our mountains, our plains, and meadows and forests. That's what Ronald Reagan said. This is our patrimony. This is what we leave to our children, and our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

Does the bill that we're considering today leave the land better than we found it? I think you know the answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on this rule and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have to admit that in a prior existence, when I was a debate teacher in high school, one of the things we taught our kids—because every team did it—was, regardless of what the bill was that the affirmative presented, to come up with a series of problems. In every instance, the negative team would always end with this plan, whatever the plan was, resulting in a melting of the polar icecap, which would trigger a thermonuclear war. It didn't matter what the affirmative plan had. One of the negative arguments was it will melt the polar icecap and trigger a thermonuclear war.

Sometimes when we're here on the floor, I feel that we're doing those same kinds of debate cases, because it doesn't matter what the bill is; it's going to do all sorts of things. This bill simply says that, before you implement a rule or regulation, you're going to study everything, including its impact.

One of the speakers who came to the floor said there are two rules that are going to be prohibited in this bill. Now, there are two rules specified in this bill that say, before you implement them, see what they will do to the jobs and the economic cost. I mean, these rules could increase the electricity costs for everyone, rich or poor, by 3, 4, 5 percent or more. We don't know. Study it first before you do it.

There was a rule that was passed in my State dealing with particulate matter. In my area, in one of the very remote rural areas, we do testing on solid rocket motors.

□ 1330

That testing could violate this rule. No one knows for sure because the EPA didn't do that kind of analysis.

One of the private sector groups said the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency disturbingly admitted that the impact on American jobs is not a consideration in rulemaking, even while the United States continues to struggle through the recession and unacceptably high unemployment.

I'm sorry, that's one of the things that should be considered in rulemaking. Is there an executive order

that mandates it? Yeah, but it's not being done.

So what we want to do is to have a law passed that says, yeah, what is not being considered should be considered. It doesn't stop the rulemaking, it doesn't stop the rule, it doesn't roll back anything, it doesn't kill anybody, it doesn't melt the polarized cap, and it doesn't start thermonuclear war. It simply says we will have a commission, interagency, together to look at specific things; and we will consider it.

So before you come up with another rule or regulation, you know the total impact, what it does to the environment, what it does to the economy, what it does to human beings.

Studying is something we should all recognize and we should all want. This is what the bill does. It doesn't destroy anything, it doesn't cut anything, it doesn't stop anything. It just says before you proceed, you know what you're doing, and that should be common sense.

That should be what we were doing in the first place. And if it takes a piece of legislation to make sure we do what we should have been doing in the first place, let's pass this legislation, this bipartisan legislation with Republican and Democrat sponsors that was passed with Republican and Democrat votes—and actually one Republican voted against it as well.

This is a bipartisan process, this is a bipartisan bill, this is a good piece of underlying legislation, and it is an incredibly fair rule because, remember, 12 of the 14 amendments, every one that could be made in order, was made in order to be discussed and debated on this floor, which is the way we should be doing things at all times. It's a great process, and I look forward to listening to the debate on all 12 amendments as well as the base bill when we finally get to the position of debating this bill on the floor.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2401—the TRAIN Act. At a time when we have 14 million people out of work in this country, we must enact commonsense policies that will reduce the regulatory burden on job creators so that they can put people back to work.

Unfortunately, over the past 30 months under the Obama Administration, the EPA has issued a wide array of large, expensive regulations that affect virtually every facet of the U.S. economy, from homeowners, hospitals, and farmers to small businesses and manufacturers. H.R. 2401 addresses two of the more egregious of these regulations. First, the Utility MACT is designed to limit emissions of mercury, acid gases, and non-mercury metals from power plants. Next, the Transport Rule is designed to establish specific statewide caps for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from power plants.

Madam Speaker, through these proposed rules, the combined cost on job creators will be \$17.8 billion annually and will jeopardize 1.4 million jobs by 2020. The Utility MACT rule alone is estimated to increase electricity costs on families by nearly 4% at a time when our economy can least afford it.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I commend the leadership of Chairman UPTON and Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman WHITFIELD for their leadership on this issue. H.R. 2401 would put the brakes on several of EPA's most damaging regulations until an interagency committee can fully study the cumulative effect of all proposed rules. This study would analyze both the health and social benefits as well, as the actual impact on economic competitiveness, trade, energy supplies, consumer spending, and jobs.

Madam Speaker, millions of out-of-work Americans are desperately crying out for us to help put them back to work. During these challenging economic times, we should not allow burdensome federal regulations from the EPA to add more people to the unemployment rolls. For this reason, I ask all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 406 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1366) to require the President to prepare a quadrennial national manufacturing strategy, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1534

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF
CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH
RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF
CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 30, 2011, relating to a measure making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, my Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time that is yielded is yielded for debate purposes only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter that is before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we are dealing with extraordinarily challenging times.

The American people have been sending a message to us which is powerful and overwhelming, and it's one that I believe that both Democrats and Republicans have heard, and that is: We need to get our economy back on track. We need to make sure that we

have a climate that will create jobs so that people—many of whom I represent, sadly, and I know the Speaker faces the same thing in the Show Me State of Missouri, and my friend in his State of Massachusetts faces this. We have friends and neighbors who have lost their jobs, who have lost their homes, who have lost their businesses, and the message that has come to us overwhelmingly is that we must put into place policies that will encourage job creation and economic growth.

We obviously have a very troubled global economy. The developments that have taken place in Europe have played a big role in leading to today's huge drop in the stock market. I haven't looked at it in the last few minutes, but earlier today it was down over 400 points, and I know we have obviously difficult decisions that lie ahead for many.

We, as an institution, the United States Congress, have a responsibility to address the fiscal needs and challenges that are before us. One of those challenges and one of the factors that has played a role in the economic downturn, I believe very strongly, has been the \$14½ trillion national debt that looms before us.

Again, as you know very well, Madam Speaker, in a bipartisan way, Democrats and Republicans alike decry the \$14½ trillion national debt that we have and the fact that we have deficits going as far as the eye can see.

Now, we know that last July, just before we adjourned for the month of August, we had to deal with the question of whether or not we were going to increase the debt ceiling. We tackled that issue, and we ended up coming to a bipartisan consensus. We all knew that it was necessary for us to increase the debt ceiling because there was a responsibility to pay the bills that have been accumulated in the past.

From this side of the aisle, we complained and fought against the 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending that we've seen over the past 4 years, but with that money having been spent, we recognized that the bills had to be paid.

That led us, Madam Speaker, to come to a bipartisan consensus that we would, in fact, increase the debt ceiling; but we had to tackle, in a bipartisan way, the deficit and debt issues that are looming before us.

So we put into place a joint select committee which, as we all know, is going to be charged with, by November 23, completing its work and, by December 23, having a vote in the House and the Senate. And if they're not successful, we will deal with sequestration, which will be across-the-board spending cuts that I don't think anyone wants to see happen because we want to be in a position where we make those decisions for \$1½ trillion. And as many have said, that group of Senators the other day said a \$4 trillion—excuse me—\$4 billion. What is the number? I was right, \$4 trillion. Excuse me. You

know the proverbial Everett Dirksen line: A billion here, a billion there; before long, you're talking about real money. And that was five decades ago that he said that, and we are where we are now.

So the plan, as proposed by some, Madam Speaker, would take us to as much as \$4 trillion in spending cuts, and I hope we can do that in a bipartisan way.

Now we are in a position where we—as I said yesterday during the debate on the rule on this issue, last year, for the first time since the 1974 Budget Act was put into place, we didn't have a budget that was proposed to us.

□ 1540

Hey, I'm not in the business of pointing the finger of blame. I'm just in the business of looking at the facts of where we are. So we know what has been inherited. We know, as we hear these very strong statements being made, that we've gone through a difficult 9 months. We had to deal with the continuing resolution to simply clean up the mess. The Acting Speaker is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and she knows very well the challenges that we had with those appropriations bills having to be done last year. That Appropriations Committee on which the Acting Speaker sits has to deal with this issue, and had to deal with it earlier this year. Today, Madam Speaker, we are in a similar position.

We, right now, know that the fiscal year comes to an end next week. We have some very important priorities that need to be addressed, and the one that everyone is talking about is the fact that we have seen disaster after disaster hit this Nation. We are determined to ensure that those who have suffered most over the past several weeks and months from disasters—flooding—and I remember seeing my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) yesterday. He sent out photographs of the devastation of the flooding that has taken place in Vermont. In Pennsylvania, we just had a Republican Conference at which one of our new colleagues, Mr. MARINO, was up, talking about the fact that he has been walking through mud, talking to families—to parents who have their children literally sitting on automobiles because they can't get into their homes—and asking what it is that they're going to do.

We have our fellow Americans who are suffering, and we want to ensure that the dollars necessary for the Federal Emergency Management Agency are there. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported to us that we're seeing about \$30 million a day being expended through the FEMA funding, and there's about \$200 million left. So we are faced with the prospect of expiration—the expiration of all of the resources that FEMA needs—by this weekend, Madam Speaker. That's the reason that we are back here today.

We all know what happened yesterday. The Democratic majority and some Republicans chose to vote “no” on the continuing resolution, which would simply take us from now to November 18—a very short period of time, just a matter of a month and a half—so that during that time we can, as Speaker BOEHNER has said, deal with the overall appropriations process and establish the priorities. So we are here today, having had a meeting in the Rules Committee last night, calling for same-day consideration so that, quite possibly, with some modifications, we can bring up that bill which had enjoyed bipartisan support.

It is no secret, I’m sure the Democrats will acknowledge, that the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. DICKS from Seattle, both had indicated earlier support. They acknowledge it. They’re on the record as having done that. They said that they had changed their minds, and I respect that. Members have a right to change their minds. We all have a right to change our minds. But that decision was made, and we went to the vote and the votes were not there.

Madam Speaker, I think there is clearly a bipartisan understanding that ensuring that resources get to our fellow Americans who are suffering due to these disasters that have hit—hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding—is a priority that we all share. Personally, I’d like to see the Federal Government get out of being the place of first resort for the American people to look to when there is a time of disaster.

In fact, the Acting Speaker’s late husband, with whom I was elected in 1980, led an effort, going back decades, when he served here, that was working on proposals for us to address the disaster relief issue, which was a very, very challenging one. He explored and came up with some great proposals for how we could deal with disasters beyond having the Federal Government be the place of first resort for the American people when they are faced with the aftermath of a disaster.

But, Madam Speaker, those changes that were proposed by my late colleague Bill Emerson were not made in order, were not addressed, were not implemented, and so we are where we are; and while I’d love to see those changes down the road, today we need to address the very pressing needs that our fellow Americans have for some kind of resolution to this issue.

We have this same-day rule so that we can today pass with what I hope will be strong bipartisan support a continuing resolution that will simply carry us from now to November 18, during which time we will see, Madam Speaker, you and the other members of the Appropriations Committee work to come up with some kind of resolution to this issue.

I am going to urge my colleagues to support this measure in the name of bipartisanship, in the name of our effort to try and resolve this pressing issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman DREIER, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here we go again, Madam Speaker. Republicans are, once again, going back on their promises for a more open, more transparent House of Representatives—another martial law rule designed to fix problems of their own doing, another effort to break the rules just to fix their own mess.

And it didn’t have to be this way.

For months, we’ve known that more disaster assistance was needed to address the aftermath of the tragedy in Joplin and, more recently, to address the damage caused by Irene as it made its way from North Carolina up the east coast into New England. Americans respond to natural disasters. That’s what we do. We always have. We rise to the occasion when our neighbors are in need. The problem is when politicians start playing politics with people’s lives, and that’s where we find ourselves today.

Yesterday, the Republican leadership brought a continuing resolution to the floor that not only provided less disaster assistance than that of the Senate, it also offset that funding by cutting a green jobs initiative. It’s not enough that we’ve been in session 261 days without a single jobs proposal from the Republicans. With yesterday’s continuing resolution, Republicans actually proposed cutting a jobs program just to make political points with their Tea Party base.

Yesterday, Democrats said enough—enough to the job-killing Republican agenda, enough to the notion that fiscal austerity means turning our backs on people in need, enough to the “my way or the highway” attitude that seems to make up the ideology of the Republican leadership.

Yesterday, 48 Republicans joined 182 Democrats in defeating the continuing resolution. According to Politico, it was “an embarrassing setback.”

Yesterday, Republicans and Democrats said, Don’t play games with the lives of Americans.

It’s almost as if the Republicans blame the victims of the hurricane and tornado for having the audacity to live in the paths of those natural disasters. So here we are again, forced to consider a martial law rule in an attempt to fix the problems that the Republicans, themselves, created, a martial law rule that not only waives the rules of the House but that also allows for the immediate consideration of a new continuing resolution.

No time to read the bill, even though the Republicans started out the year by promising 72 hours to look at any legislation voted on in the House. No

time to read the bill. No ability to amend the bill.

So much for the new open Congress. It wasn’t too long ago that my colleagues on the Rules Committee were touting the new open Congress. Look how far this new Republican House has fallen.

Madam Speaker, it is disappointing that we’re here today. It’s disappointing that the Republicans are making a mockery of the legislative process. It’s disappointing that they continue to choose politics over the American people. The American people deserve better than this.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend that it’s very unfortunate. In my opening remarks, I made the best attempt that I could to be as bipartisan as possible. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that we’ve had the most open House, the most transparent process, and that more amendments have been made in order.

I am very proud that the Rules Committee has repeatedly made McGovern amendments in order that have been proposed to the Rules Committee. In the measure that we have addressing the regulation issue, we made every single amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order—an amendment offered by my friend Mr. HASTINGS.

So, to talk about these sorts of crocodile tears, Madam Speaker, the House has gotten to a new low. We need to make sure that the American people who are suffering and in need have the resources that are necessary.

□ 1550

The measure that is before us has a higher level of funding for those who are in need than the President has proposed to ensure that we immediately get those dollars to the people who are suffering, and there are people all over this country who have been suffering through these disasters, and it needs to be done.

Madam Speaker, I will say that we are what we are. The legislative process is not always a pretty one, but I began by talking about our priority of job creation and economic growth; limiting the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government; trying to decrease the regulatory burden, which our TRAIN Act—which we just debated the rule on a little while ago—is designed to address these sorts of steps, designed to make sure that more Americans will have opportunities to be members of the workforce, to be able to support their families and so that people won’t see their small businesses lost because of the economic downturn. Those are the priorities that we have, and getting our fiscal house in order while meeting our priorities which, in this day and age, disaster assistance is one of, are what we’ve got to do.

So I am proud to work closely with my Democratic colleagues. I am proud of the fact that they have been supportive, Madam Speaker, of a number of the measures that we have had before us; and I am proud that we have been able to take many of their ideas, Madam Speaker, and allow them to be considered on the House floor so that we've been able to have a free-flowing debate.

That's what the American people want. I believe that since every Member of this House represents just about the same number of people, about 600,000. Under the new census, it will be, I think, 704,000 constituents, that they have a right to be heard, they have a right to have their ideas considered.

That hasn't always been the case under Republicans or Democrats in the past, but today it is. We're doing our doggone-est to make sure that more Members have their ideas considered.

I am very proud of that fact, and I will say that I regularly have Democrats come to me and say they are very appreciative of the fact that we have been able to allow their ideas to be considered on the House floor.

I am proud of the strides that we have been making under Speaker BOEHNER. We have a long way to go, but this is all inside baseball stuff. As you know very well, Madam Speaker, the priority is job creation and economic growth to ensure that our fellow Americans have the kinds of opportunities that they need.

Let us proceed. This is a procedure that I don't particularly like, but in light of the fact that there had been a bipartisan agreement yesterday that did not work out—that's about the nicest way that I can put it, it didn't work out—and so we had no choice other than to allow for a rule that would provide for same-day consideration simply of this measure to ensure that we don't go through a government shutdown.

I mean, we wouldn't be doing a same-day rule, Madam Speaker, if we weren't faced with, frankly, the threat—and I'm not going to point the finger of blame, but I will say it hasn't been Republicans who have been talking about the idea of a government shutdown. It's something that has come from some others and some on the other side of the Capitol who have talked about the prospect of that. We want to avoid it. We want to ensure it doesn't happen.

And so we're going to have an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to have a measure before us that will address the very important priorities of disaster assistance and other areas which doesn't cut as much as I would like. I would have loved to have voted "no" yesterday, Madam Speaker, because I believe that the spending level is higher than it should be.

The Republicans do, in fact, have a majority in the House of Representatives, but our Democratic colleagues

have a majority in the United States Senate. We know that President Obama is a Democrat. In light of that, we have to come to some kind of a bipartisan consensus. So we're turning ourselves inside out to make that happen, and we have done it time and time again; and this is another example of it.

I hope that we will be able to move ahead and as expeditiously as possible provide the assurance that our fellow Americans need.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I'm a little bit confused. The gentleman referred to the legislation before us that it would provide this for the American people and that for the American people.

The legislation before us is a martial law rule which says that a bill that we have yet to see will be able to be brought up on the floor for same-day consideration. So I don't know what's in the new continuing resolution.

Maybe the gentleman can enlighten us: Do we expect a vote on the continuing resolution today? When can we see this continuing resolution? Does the gentleman have any insight that he can fill us in on and when Members might actually be able to see the bill?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. First of all, let me express my apologies; 99.999 percent of the time I am always riveted to the words of my friend from Worcester when he is offering his thoughts. I have to admit I was talking to our distinguished Rules Committee colleague, Mr. WEBSTER, over here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me reclaim my time and repeat the question.

The question is that the gentleman on a number of occasions referred to that the bill provides this for the American people and that for the American people when the bill before us is a martial law rule. We haven't seen the continuing resolution. When do we expect to see it? Are we voting on it today?

Mr. DREIER. First of all, let me thank the gentleman and say that he is right on mark in raising that question. It's not only a fair question; it's an appropriate question to ask of me.

The answer is we will have a meeting in the House Rules Committee right upstairs on the third floor, at which time we will have before us a proposal that I can tell you will be very similar to the measure that was considered yesterday. As you know, there was \$1.043 trillion in that proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I can reclaim my time, will that be in the next hour? Will that be today?

Mr. DREIER. It's my hope that we'll be able to do this today. That's the reason, as my friend knows, we were going to pass this measure yesterday and it

didn't work out. I mean, that's part of the legislative process.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, the Rules Committee will consider it today, and then we would vote on it tonight? Is that the plan?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, what I would say is that I hope the Rules Committee will be able to meet in the not-too-distant future. It's now about 2½ minutes before 4 o'clock. I can't say how quickly we'll be able to meet.

We certainly, as is always the case, will give the minority ample notice for them to have a chance to look at whatever modifications are made to the continuing resolution that will be before us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is that 1 hour or 72 hours?

Mr. DREIER. Excuse me?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will you give me 1 hour, or 72 hours as was promised?

Mr. DREIER. I have no idea what the gentleman is talking about. What is 72 hours? What is that?

Mr. MCGOVERN. My understanding was that one of the pledges of the new Republican majority was that we were going to have a 72-hour layover to be able to read the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Well, there was never any such pledge made. If the gentleman looks at the rules of the House, he knows very well that there's nothing in there that states 72 hours.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I could reclaim my time, I thought in the rules of the House it was 3 calendar days.

Mr. DREIER. That is true. As the gentleman knows very well, we're in a position right now where we're dealing with an emergency situation; the American people are hurting. We had the measure before us with a full 3 days. It was put online on Monday, and so we had the 3 full days. And it is true, we're looking at what would be possibly an amendment to that measure, and so we will be in compliance.

First of all, again, let me say, Madam Speaker, that there was not any 72 hours in the rules of the House, if the gentleman would look at the rules of the House. It is a 3-day layover requirement, and I believe that we will be in full compliance with the 3-day layover.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, if I understand the gentleman correctly, we may or may not meet soon. We may or may not vote on it today.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that obviously we had a bipartisan agreement that was voted on yesterday that did not enjoy bipartisan support. I say that based on

the fact that we had agreements made in colloquies that took place—

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I can reclaim my time, the gentleman mentioned our distinguished minority whip on a number of occasions. I don't recall him ever saying that he supported the Republican bill.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Let me specifically say that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, indicated before the gentleman and the other Rules Committee members and me that he would be supportive of the measure; and he had a right to change his mind.

And, second, in the colloquy that took place last week between the distinguished minority whip and the majority leader, the minority whip indicated that he was supportive of the continuing resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I don't recall that, and I'll check with the minority whip to double-check on that.

I guess I'm just trying to provide some information to the Members of the House who are watching what's going on.

Am I correct in saying that, as of right now, we don't know when we're going to meet and we don't know when we'll see a final version of the continuing resolution?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me say that, first, to address the issue that was raised earlier, there was confusion. I don't know what the gentleman meant about 72 hours. There is a 3-day layover requirement. We will not, and let me underscore again, Madam Speaker, we will not be waiving the 3-day layover requirement; okay? So, I just think it's important for us to make that point. The gentleman repeatedly raises 72 hours and we're not in compliance with this and that, when, in fact, Madam Speaker, we will not be waiving. It's a 3-day layover requirement that exists, and we will not be waiving that.

Second, as far as what time, I believe that, within the next few hours, we'll be able to meet in the Rules Committee and come to the House floor. There are no guarantees. There are no guarantees, but I believe there is a very good chance that we will be able to, in the next few hours, meet in the Rules Committee and the gentleman and I will come to the floor with a rule that will allow us to make in order the continuing resolution to ensure that our fellow Americans who are suffering will have the resources they need.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, if I may ask the gentleman one additional question, does he anticipate that the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loan Program will be cut in the new version of the con-

tinuing resolution that will be brought before us?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say, at this juncture, I cannot tell my friend exactly what this measure is going to consist of, but we're in a position right now where that will be considered by the Committee on Rules when we meet upstairs. So we'll be meeting upstairs and we'll see whether that might be an amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, just for the record, I would like to have inserted a letter from Paul A. Yost, who's the vice president at the National Association of Manufacturers, and a letter from R. Bruce Josten, who is the executive vice president, Government Affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, both strongly objecting to the offset that Republicans included in the continuing resolution that we considered yesterday that went down.

One of the reasons there was great objection over this, Madam Speaker, was because this program that was cut actually was a job-creating program putting people to work. I would say to my colleagues, if you want to reduce the debt in this country, you ought to figure out a way to put people back to work; and the way you put people back to work is not cut every single program that provides assistance to business and to people to be able to get on their feet and create jobs.

We have a crisis in this country that is not being addressed by this House of Representatives which has yet to consider a single jobs bill. And instead, we have a continuing resolution that gets brought to the floor that provides less disaster assistance than the Senate bill does to people who are in need and pays for it, offsets it, by cutting a program to create jobs. What sense does that make?

When it comes to disaster relief, we have never, ever, ever offset disaster relief because you can't predict with any accuracy whether there's going to be a tornado next year or a hurricane next year or an earthquake next year.

There are some things we don't offset we should offset; for example, the wars. We've been in Afghanistan for 10 years, and I can't figure out why we're still there, but we're still there. Ten years. I can predict pretty much—very accurately—how much it will cost to stay another year, and yet we borrow that money. We put it on the credit card. We borrow \$10 billion a month for military operations in Afghanistan that goes onto our credit card; not paid for. Not paid for.

But when it comes to helping people in this country who have been adversely impacted by a natural disaster, through no fault of their own, who have lost their homes, who've seen

their communities devastated, all of a sudden we're here saying we've got to find these offsets. And where do the offsets come from? They don't come from Donald Trump's tax cut. Where they come from is a program to put people to work.

The gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee, talks about this great openness that we have in the Rules Committee. I have offered, I think about half a dozen times, an amendment to go after the U.S. taxpayer-funded oil subsidies, these subsidies that we provide oil companies that are making record profits, and we can't even get that issue for a vote on this House floor.

I hope we have enough time to read what's in the bill. I hope that we have enough time to understand what's in the bill. I hope that we meet today. I hope that we meet at a decent hour. But we don't have the answers to any of those questions, and I think that that's unfortunate when it comes to a bill about the funding, the continuing funding of our government.

Again, Madam Speaker, I regret that we are here. I regret that we are debating a martial law rule. We're not debating a continuing resolution right now. It's a martial rule that basically shuts everything down and allows them to bring up a bill any time they want to bring a bill up. People won't even have time to read it. And we'll have that vote possibly today. But again, we don't have any definite commitments from the other side what time or even if it will be today.

I will close by saying, Madam Speaker, that I think it is important that this House gets back to the issue of jobs and protecting and caring for the people here in this country. Our biggest challenges, I'm going to tell my friends on the other side, are not halfway around the world; some of them are just halfway down the block. I regret very much that this Congress has yet to deal with the issue of jobs.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2011.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, strongly supports disaster relief funding to assist victims of natural disasters. The Chamber is also a vocal proponent of fiscal responsibility and recognizes that Congress must make difficult but necessary choices among competing priorities.

As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) loan program. First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes. Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that

is critical to the nation's recovery. Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry; numerous loan applicants have been in the queue for years, waiting for the Administration to complete its due diligence.

Again, while the Chamber understands the importance of reducing America's unacceptable debt and believes that all programs must be on the table, the Chamber urges you to bear in mind the facts about the ATVM loan program, which promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component of America's energy security.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS,

Washington, DC, September 22, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,

Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,

Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: The NAM is the largest trade association in the United States, representing over 11,000 small, medium and large manufacturers in all 50 states. We are the leading voice for the manufacturing economy, which provides millions of high-wage jobs in the U.S. Two-thirds of our members are small businesses, which serve as the engine for job growth. Our mission is to enhance the competitiveness of manufacturers and improve American living standards by shaping a legislative and regulatory environment conducive to U.S. economic growth.

The NAM is writing to express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program, authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs and put our nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.

Introducing any new model motor vehicle is a capital intensive process. Automobile manufacturers and suppliers must make large investments at the front end before a vehicle enters production. The ATVM program assists this process by providing low cost capital for retooling U.S. facilities. These loans, which will be repaid with interest, allow automakers to build more fuel-efficient advance technology vehicles in the U.S. and provide greater job security for the workers they employ. Furthermore, it is worth noting that many suppliers to the automobile manufacturers are small and medium manufacturers. These smaller manufacturers have the potential to create thousands of jobs but are typically some of the first businesses impacted by a struggling economy. By maintaining the ATVM program the government will also be supporting the maintenance and growth of these smaller manufacturers.

During this time of economic recovery, we urge you to preserve this successful program that is helping preserve auto sector jobs and make promote energy security.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. YOST.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me say, Madam Speaker, to my very good friend that jobs and job creation are exactly what virtually every piece of legislation that we've been ad-

ressing in this House has been designed to deal with. Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the nearly \$1 trillion—it was like \$787 billion, I think, and then if you add the interest, it came up to like \$1.1 trillion. That stimulus bill was their jobs bill. As I recall, we were told, if we saw that \$1 trillion stimulus bill implemented, that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent.

Well, Madam Speaker, in part of the area that I represent, we have an unemployment rate of 14 percent. We have a national unemployment rate of over 9 percent, and it's not acceptable. So I totally concur with my friend's assessment, and I congratulate him. I congratulate him for his opening statement there when he said the best way for us to deal with the deficit is to make sure that people in this country have jobs.

Economic growth is what we've been talking about. I believe if we had 2, 3, 4 percent more GDP growth in this country, we wouldn't be here having this discussion. The question is: How is it that we get our fellow Americans back to work?

We believe that it's essential to create long-term, good jobs in the private sector. We believe in doing things like opening up new markets around the world, because 96 percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders. And yet, unfortunately, we have not been able to have, yet, the agreements that have been negotiated over the past several years sent to us in the Congress to vote on. Clearly, if we had the agreements that have been negotiated between the Koreans and the United States, the Colombians and the United States, the Panamanians and the United States, we would create many, many jobs here in the United States.

Yesterday, Madam Speaker, I met with the Ambassador from Colombia. On August 15, they implemented an agreement with Canada for a free trade agreement between Canada and Colombia. And guess what? There has been an 18.9 percent increase in wheat exports from Canada to Colombia in 1 single month.

□ 1610

Now, Madam Speaker, I have said this time and time again here. We have union and nonunion workers who are employed by companies, great American companies that are manufacturing companies like Caterpillar, John Deere, and Whirlpool, and we could get these people working, we could get these people working if we could open up new markets for those manufactured products in Latin America and in Asia. That's exactly what we've got ahead of us. And I hope very much that the President will immediately send to us those agreements so that we can enjoy, again, bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans working together to pass these agreements.

If we do that, we will do exactly what my friend just said, Madam Speaker, we will do exactly what my friend just said in his opening statement there. What he said was we need to get Americans into jobs so that we can have the revenues that are necessary for us to deal with the deficit and debt challenges that we have.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just found out some news here in answer to a question I had earlier about offsets. Apparently, according to the National Journal, the Republican leaders are considering tacking on as much as \$100 million in additional offsets to their GOP continuing resolution they are bringing to the floor. That is a quote attributed to House Rules Committee Chairman DAVID DREIER. So I just read in the National Journal basically that there will be additional offsets.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, let me just say that I hope very much we are able to see offsets for this because, again, we have a \$14.5 trillion national debt. We have deficits as far as the eye can see. So, as we deal with the very important priorities of ensuring that our fellow Americans who are suffering because of these tragic disasters that have taken place across the country—we need to realize that there is a hell of a lot of waste in the Federal Government, a hell of a lot of waste, and there are regulations.

Again, the measure that I just mentioned, my friends said that we haven't had jobs bills before us, but the measure that Mr. HASTINGS was just managing the rule on is designed to deal with the burden of regulations which have undermined the potential for job creation and economic growth.

Again, pursuing an economic growth agenda is a priority of ours, and making sure that we get our fiscal house in order is one of those. So that is why I will say to my friend in response to his question, you bet we are going to try and find areas where the Federal Government has been expending dollars that have not been spent wisely and use those dollars to ensure that those who are suffering and those who are in need have what is necessary for them to survive.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Which brings me back to my original point of why it's important for us to see this bill. You say that you want to eliminate waste, but the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says that the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program is not waste; it creates jobs. So I don't know where else you're going to cut.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, let me say to my friend we are not going to waive the 3-day layover requirement, and whatever changes are made in this

measure will be addressed in the House Rules Committee and then fully debated on this House floor so the Members will have an opportunity to decide whether or not they are going to support the special rule that would then make in order consideration of this continuing resolution that will prevent a government shutdown, make sure that the resources for those who are suffering are made available, and take us to November 18 so that very thoughtful members of the Appropriations Committee, like the acting Speaker, will be able to deal with the appropriations priorities that we need to between now and November 18.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to make sure the record is clear when it comes to Democratic support for the continuing resolution. In his pen and pad press conference, Minority Whip HOYER said he was "loath" to support yesterday's CR, and I have a copy of that press conference and the transcript of the colloquy that went on on the House floor here. So if anybody is interested in reading it in detail, I have it here.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee and my good friend for yielding. I echo all of the sentiments that he has made previously.

Firstly, I'd like to point to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers, in its last sentence in a letter directed to Senator REID and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, says, "During this time of economic recovery, we urge you to preserve this successful program"—meaning the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—"that is helping preserve auto sector jobs and promote energy security."

Bruce Josten, from the Chamber of Commerce, while citing to all Members of the House of Representatives that the chamber "understands the importance of reducing America's unacceptable debt and believes that all programs must be on the table, the chamber urges you to bear in mind the facts about the ATVM loan program, which promotes manufacturing in the United States and is an important component of America's energy security."

I only cited that for the reason that there could be no better person to know what martial law is than the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who is my good friend. He and I, he and Mr. MCGOVERN and I, Ms. SLAUGHTER and he and I have been back and forth on martial law when Democrats were in charge and when Republicans were in charge. One thing you need to understand is this is martial law that you are bringing this rule under, and we don't even know what's in the bill.

Yesterday afternoon, the Republican leadership brought up a bill that failed

American workers, failed our Nation's economy, and failed those struggling to recover from natural disasters. It is no surprise that their rank and file then failed them.

Rather than take up language that has already passed the Senate with bipartisan support, Republicans instead chose to pit unemployed factory workers against hurricane victims. This is not the kind of behavior that will bring our Nation out of this recession.

While Republicans continue their partisan squabbles, countless Americans are fighting for their livelihoods. Six years after Hurricane Katrina, roofs are still being replaced, homes are being repaired and paperwork is still pending for funds that have yet to be allocated. And if you've been to New Orleans, you'll see a whole section of that city that is not in repair.

In my home State of Florida, FEMA has already delayed \$1.68 million for work resulting from 2004 and 2005 Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, Jeanne and Dennis.

Given my colleague's distorted priorities, I can't help but wonder how long will the people of New England have to wait since we've been waiting in Florida since 2004 and 2005.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. And some have been waiting for drought relief and flood relief for an equal number of years. But this appears to be of no consequence to my Republican colleagues as they fail to recognize that their ideological posturing has very real repercussions. Once again, their irresponsible behavior and unwillingness to compromise has put us on the brink of yet another shutdown.

H. Res. 409 unnecessarily will provide for same-day consideration of another Republican continuing resolution, violating the House Republicans' rules package passed in January which provided that all bills will be available to the public 3 days before coming to a vote. Not only did we not get the required 72 hours, we didn't get 24 hours.

The Speaker made it very clear. He said that we will dispense with the conventional wisdom that bigger bills are always better; that fast legislating is good legislating; and that allowing additional amendments and open debate makes the legislative process less efficient than our forefathers intended. Legislators and the public will have 3 days to read bills before they come to a vote.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1620

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. We were told we would have 3 days to read bills before they come to a vote. We were told that they would be on the Internet

and that technology is available so that all of America could see what we're doing. And as the Speaker said—and I thoroughly agree—fast legislating is not good legislating, especially when there is no need to require a rushed, closed process. As far as we know, we're voting on a same-day rule for a bill we don't even know exists. Before we even ask to spend billions of dollars, we should have some idea of what's going on. And it's not enough for me to hear that we're going to hear about it in the Rules Committee later on. I want to know what's going on right now.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, first, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend from Fort Lauderdale, my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, that I'd like to associate myself with a segment of the remarks that he made talking about the priority of addressing the very pressing needs of those who are suffering because of the disasters that have taken place in this country. My friend is absolutely right, and that's the reason that we are here.

Now, I would like to say that I don't know where it is that my friends get this 72 hours that's discussed regularly. Mr. MCGOVERN has raised that, Mr. HASTINGS has raised it, Madam Speaker, and I don't know where they get that. We have what is known as the 3-day layover requirement. And let me clarify this because obviously some of my colleagues don't completely understand. I'm talking about the rules of the House, not statements that may have been made. The rules of the House say that there is a 3-day layover requirement.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, this measure was put online; the bill that we voted on yesterday was put online. It calls for \$1.043 trillion in spending on an annual basis as we address keeping the government going, ensuring we don't have a government shutdown between now and November 18. That was put online on Monday.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just wanted to respond to your statement that you don't know where we—

Mr. DREIER. Are you telling me I can't associate myself with your remarks?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. No, that you don't know where we got the 72 hours from. Well, if you go on the Speaker's Web site, you will see in the very first paragraph what he says in that regard with reference to 72 hours. Perhaps that's where we got it from.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I will tell my friend that the rules of the House are what we are complying with. The rules of the House say a 3-day layover requirement. On Monday, this was made available and put online. And now my friend says, I want to see it now, I want to see exactly what we're considering.

The reason that we will not be waiving the 3-day layover requirement is that we are going to have a bill that is very similar to the measure that we had last night, with possibly an amendment made to that.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Just one thing, Mr. Chairman: Does the Speaker's word matter or not?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, I will tell you that I don't know what he means by the "Speaker's word." The rules of the House are what we live by.

The rules of the House say that it needs to be made available online for 3 days. And guess what, Madam Speaker? We are in full compliance with the rules of the House, and we have no intention to waive that.

Okay. I'm looking now at a statement that was made on some program on Fox that says: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours." Let me say thank you. I want to express my great appreciation. And I appreciate the size of the type, too, making it very easy for me to read it across the aisle here, another indication of our bridging the gap between either side of the aisle here, which is something I greatly appreciate.

It did turn out that the Speaker did say that, but then we came forward with a rules package; and that's why what I'm saying is the rules say that we will in fact have 3 days. A 3-day layover requirement needs to be met, and that's what the rules of the House consist of.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, one thing I really would like to make clear and take out some of the hyperbole and the passion from my side or yours, we know, and you have said—and I echo your expressions with reference to the need for us to address—

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time for just one moment—and the reason I'm doing that is that I'm told that we have about 1 minute or so left, and I know my friend has 10 minutes. So could my friend yield to the gentleman and me? I know we're going to get the great poster with the Speaker's quote up there again, and I will look forward to reading it again, and I will join in reading it again with you all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The only thing I am trying to get across is I don't want the American public to believe that whenever we get through—whether it's 72 hours, or whenever it is—that that means that the des-

perately needed money in Vermont and in New England and other places is going to be forthcoming most immediately because I'm telling you that from '04 and '05, from six hurricanes we are not being paid in the State of Florida.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just very quickly say that it was explained to us by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee today that we're spending about \$30 million a day. There's \$200 million in the account; it's scheduled to expire by this weekend. Passage of this measure tonight is something that will ensure that we will at least have those resources, and I hope we can address the needs of those Floridians who continue to suffer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Well, not only Floridians.

Mr. DREIER. And others in this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Exactly. That's the point. From tornadoes, from hurricanes, from fires, all over the place.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that I'm going to close the debate over here as soon as my friend holds up that brilliant poster of the Fox News interview that Speaker BOEHNER had.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to hold this poster up because I want to make sure that it's clear to everybody. I'm going to quote this: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours." JOHN BOEHNER, Fox News, "America's News Room," 7/22/2010.

Mr. Speaker, we can have all the verbal gyrations that we can come up with here about how not to kind of get to the point, which is that we're not going to be able to have 3 days or 72 hours or 3 legislative days—or three anything—to look at this bill. And the bill that we're going to be debating later today or tomorrow—we don't really know—is going to be different. And we know it's going to be different because the chairman of the Rules Committee said in an interview that we have online to National Journal that there's probably going to be another \$100 million more in offsets. And so where are those offsets coming from?

We know that one of the offsets that was in the continuing resolution yesterday was an offset that actually was a job killer, that actually is something that not only Democrats supported, but the United States Chamber of Commerce supported. Everyone came together and agreed that this is a good program, and it was cut, and it is going to discourage job creation in this country.

So I think it is important to know where these offsets are going to be coming from. And, again, let me repeat

what I've said over and over: this has not been a bipartisan process. The only thing bipartisan about this continuing resolution was the opposition to it.

And, again, I would tell my Republican friends that the reason why this promise by Speaker BOEHNER is important is because we do need to understand what's in the bill. We're beginning to understand that your rules don't live up to what you actually promised.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing about this that I think is important for people to understand is that never, ever, ever have we ever insisted on offsets for emergency spending for disasters. We don't know whether there will be one, two, three, or no emergencies that hit our country next year or the year after or the year after that. Maybe my Republican friends have now figured out a way to predict earthquakes and tsunamis and hurricanes and tornadoes, but we don't know how to predict with any accuracy.

And this notion that we're not going to be there, that we're going to insist on offsets in order to provide people who have been thrown out of their homes, whose communities have been destroyed through no fault of their own, that we can find an offset when we don't need any offsets for nation-building in Afghanistan, that's all on your credit card. There's no offsets needed for that.

□ 1630

Why is it that no offsets are needed to do that kind of stuff, but when it comes to helping people in this country, all of a sudden we become super fiscally conservative? We need to have offsets for everything.

You want to reduce the debt? Put people back to work. That's how you do it. Cutting programs that put people back to work doesn't put people back to work. It slows down the economic recovery.

Here we are in September, and we have yet to deal with a single jobs bill on this floor. I don't know what it's like in California, but I can tell you in Massachusetts, when I go home, people want to talk about jobs and the economy. Yes, they want to reduce the debt, and they understand, by ending some of these wars, by cutting back on some of these overseas bases that we have, by asking Donald Trump to pay his fair share.

There's something wrong in this country when a billionaire hedge fund manager pays a lower tax rate than his secretary. It's like, no, we can't ask that person, that billionaire to pay his fair share. Everything is aimed at working people and those who are most vulnerable.

We should be talking about putting America back to work. We should be debating every day about ways to stimulate this economy, to provide incentives to put people back to work, to find ways to stop incentivizing corporations to send American jobs overseas.

Instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle are protecting all that status quo. I mean, they are protecting those tax breaks, those incentives that encourage jobs to go overseas. Enough. Enough.

I'll close by saying this, Mr. Speaker: When it comes to protecting subsidies for Big Oil companies, my friends are there. When it comes to rebuilding and nation building in Afghanistan, they're there. When it comes to maintaining a Tax Code that allows a billionaire hedge fund manager to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary, they're there. But when it comes to disaster assistance, when it comes to jobs, when it comes to things that matter to everyday people, it is a struggle. It is a fight.

I would urge my colleagues to rethink their priorities, to work in a bipartisan way when it comes to disaster relief and job creation.

Let's bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. If you don't like it, vote against it. But allow us to have the opportunity in this new, open House. Let us bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. Let us see whether we can pass it here. I think if this truly is an open House, we ought to have that opportunity.

I will just say, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I don't know when we're going to get this bill. I don't know where the cuts are going to be made. I don't know what other job-creating programs are going to be cut. But again, "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted on line for at least 72 hours." We're not even going to get 72 minutes, in all likelihood.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting and have been suffering from disasters over the past several weeks and months and, obviously, for a long period of time in the past.

We just had a meeting downstairs where one of my new colleagues, the gentleman from Williamsport, Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) stood up and talked about the fact that he, just days ago, was trudging through mud, meeting with the parents of small children, young children who were literally sitting on the hoods of automobiles in Pennsylvania where terrible flooding has taken place, and they have been asking him, since they had lost their homes, what he was going to do. And Mr. MARINO made it very clear that he would do everything possible to ensure that those families would have what they needed. And that's why we're here right now with the measure that we have before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this measure that will come before us later this evening is a measure that has been online more than 72 hours. It was put online on Monday. Today is Thursday, so well beyond 72 hours it's been made available.

We have actually doubled, from \$500 million to \$1 billion, the FY11 request that was made by the President because we understand the imperative of getting these resources to the American people who are suffering. We can do that, Mr. Speaker, while, at the same time, reining in the size and scope and reach and control of the Federal Government, because everyone knows, Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge, that there is waste in government, and that's the reason that we're saying we must pare the level of spending back.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this is not martial law. This is simply our step to ensure that the American people get the resources they need and that we do it in a fiscally responsible way, and it stems from what was a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge an "aye" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 409 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 409, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 406; and adoption of House Resolution 406, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 721]

YEAS—240

Adams	Canseco	Flores
Aderholt	Cantor	Forbes
Akin	Capito	Fortenberry
Alexander	Carter	Fox
Amash	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Austria	Chaffetz	Gallely
Bachus	Coble	Gardner
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Garrett
Bartlett	Cohen	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Cole	Gibbs
Bass (NH)	Conaway	Gibson
Benishek	Cravaack	Gingrey (GA)
Berg	Crawford	Gohmert
Biggert	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Culberson	Gosar
Bilirakis	Davis (KY)	Gowdy
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Granger
Black	Dent	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Griffith (AR)
Bono Mack	Dold	Griffith (VA)
Boustany	Dreier	Grimm
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Guinta
Brooks	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hall
Buchanan	Ellmers	Hanna
Bucshon	Emerson	Harper
Buerkle	Farenthold	Harris
Burgess	Fincher	Hartzler
Burton (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Flake	Hayworth
Camp	Fleischmann	Heck
Campbell	Fleming	Hensarling

Herger	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Scalise
Huelskamp	Meehan	Schilling
Huizenga (MI)	Mica	Schmidt
Hultgren	Miller (FL)	Schock
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Schweikert
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Scott (SC)
Issa	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Sessions
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Shuler
Jones	Nugent	Shuster
Jordan	Nunes	Simpson
Kelly	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Paulsen	Southerland
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Stearns
Kline	Pence	Stivers
Labrador	Petri	Stutzman
Lamborn	Pitts	Sullivan
Lance	Platts	Terry
Landry	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Lankford	Pompeo	Thornberry
Latham	Posey	Tiberi
LaTourette	Price (GA)	Tipton
Latta	Quayle	Turner (NY)
Lewis (CA)	Reed	Turner (OH)
LoBiondo	Rehberg	Upton
Long	Renacci	Walberg
Lucas	Ribble	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Walsh (IL)
Lummis	Rivera	Webster
Lungren, Daniel	Roby	West
E.	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Mack	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Wittman
Marino	Rohrabacher	Wolf
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Womack
McCaul	Rooney	Woodall
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
McCotter	Roskam	Young (AK)
McHenry	Ross (FL)	Young (FL)
McKeon	Royce	Young (IN)
McKinley	Runyan	

NAYS—180

Ackerman	Doggett	Lowey
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Lujan
Andrews	Doyle	Lynch
Baca	Edwards	Maloney
Baldwin	Ellison	Markey
Barrow	Engel	Matheson
Bass (CA)	Eshoo	Matsui
Becerra	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Berkley	Fattah	McCollum
Berman	Filner	McDermott
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McNerney
Boren	Gonzalez	Meeks
Boswell	Green, Al	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Miller (NC)
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Miller, George
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	Moore
Butterfield	Hahn	Moran
Capps	Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Cardoza	Heinrich	Napolitano
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Neal
Carney	Hinchee	Olver
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Owens
Castor (FL)	Hochul	Pallone
Chandler	Holden	Pascrell
Chu	Holt	Pastor (AZ)
Ciilline	Honda	Payne
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Perlmutter
Clay	Israel	Peters
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	Polis
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Costello	Keating	Rahall
Courtney	Kildee	Reyes
Critz	Kind	Richardson
Crowley	Kissell	Ross (AR)
Cuellar	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Levin	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lipinski	T.
Dicks	Loeback	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes

Schakowsky Smith (WA) Velázquez
 Schiff Speier Visclosky
 Schrader Stark Walz (MN)
 Schwartz Sutton Wasserman
 Scott (VA) Thompson (CA) Schultz
 Scott, David Thompson (MS) Waters
 Serrano Tierney Watt
 Sewell Tonko Waxman
 Sherman Towns Welch
 Sires Tsongas Wilson (FL)
 Slaughter Van Hollen Woolsey

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann Hirono Reichert
 Conyers Kaptur Richmond
 Deutch Lee (CA) Yarmuth
 Giffords Paul
 Higgins Rangel

□ 1711

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. MCINTYRE, CROWLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BARTLETT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 722]

YEAS—238

Adams Cravaack Hall
 Aderholt Crawford Hanna
 Akin Crenshaw Harper
 Alexander Culberson Harris
 Amash Davis (KY) Hartzler
 Amodei Denham Hastings (WA)
 Austria Dent Hayworth
 Bachus DesJarlais Heck
 Barletta Diaz-Balart Hensarling
 Bartlett Dold Herger
 Barton (TX) Dreier Herrera Beutler
 Bass (NH) Duffy Huelskamp
 Benishek Duncan (SC) Huizenga (MI)
 Berg Duncan (TN) Hultgren
 Biggert Ellmers Hunter
 Bilbray Emerson Hurt
 Bilirakis Farenthold Issa
 Bishop (UT) Fincher Jenkins
 Black Fitzpatrick Johnson (IL)
 Blackburn Flake Johnson (OH)
 Bonner Fleischmann Johnson, Sam
 Bono Mack Fleming Jones
 Boustany Flores Jordan
 Brady (TX) Forbes Kelly
 Brooks Fortenberry King (IA)
 Broun (GA) Foxx King (NY)
 Buchanan Franks (AZ) Kingston
 Bucshon Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL)
 Buerkle Gallegly Kline
 Burgess Gardner Labrador
 Burton (IN) Garrett Lamborn
 Calvert Gerlach Lance
 Camp Gibbs Landry
 Campbell Gibson Lankford
 Canseco Gingrey (GA) Latham
 Cantor Goodlatte LaTourette
 Capito Gosar Latta
 Carter Gowdy Lewis (CA)
 Cassidy Granger LoBiondo
 Chabot Graves (GA) Long
 Chaffetz Graves (MO) Lucas
 Coble Griffin (AR) Luetkemeyer
 Coffman (CO) Griffith (VA) Lummis
 Cohen Grimm Lungren, Daniel
 Cole Guinta E.
 Conaway Guthrie Mack

Manzullo Pompeo
 Marchant Posey
 Marino Price (GA)
 McCarthy (CA) Quayle
 McCaul Reed
 McClintock Rehberg
 McCotter Renacci
 McHenry Ribble
 McKeon Rigell
 McKinley Rivera
 McMorris Roby
 Rodgers Roe (TN)
 Meehan Rogers (AL)
 Mica Rogers (KY)
 Miller (FL) Rogers (MI)
 Miller (MI) Rohrabacher
 Miller, Gary Rokita
 Mulvaney Rooney
 Murphy (PA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Myrick Roskam
 Neugebauer Ross (FL)
 Noem Royce
 Nugent Runyan
 Nunes Ryan (WI)
 Nunnelee Scalise
 Olson Schilling
 Palazzo Schmidt
 Paulsen Schock
 Pearce Schweikert
 Pence Scott (SC)
 Petri Scott, Austin
 Pitts Sensenbrenner
 Platts Sessions
 Poe (TX) Shimkus

NAYS—182

Ackerman Garamendi Owens
 Altmire Gonzalez Pallone
 Andrews Green, Al Pascrell
 Baca Green, Gene Pastor (AZ)
 Baldwin Grijalva Payne
 Barrow Gutierrez Pelosi
 Bass (CA) Hahn Perlmutter
 Becerra Hanabusa Peters
 Berkley Hastings (FL) Peterson
 Berman Heinrich Pingree (ME)
 Bishop (GA) Higgins Polis
 Bishop (NY) Himes Price (NC)
 Blumenauer Hinchey Quigley
 Boren Hinojosa Rahall
 Boswell Hochul Reyes
 Brady (PA) Holden Richardson
 Braley (IA) Holt Richmond
 Brown (FL) Honda Ross (AR)
 Butterfield Hoyer Rothman (NJ)
 Capps Inslee Roybal-Allard
 Capuano Israel Ruppertsberger
 Cardoza Jackson (IL) Rush
 Carnahan Jackson Lee Ryan (OH)
 Carney (TX) Sanchez, Linda
 Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. T.
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta
 Chandler Keating Sarbanes
 Chu Kildee Schakowsky
 Cicilline Kind Schiff
 Clarke (MI) Kissell Schrader
 Clarke (NY) Kucinich Schwartz
 Clay Langevin Scott (VA)
 Cleaver Larsen (WA) Scott, David
 Clyburn Lee (CA) Serrano
 Connolly (VA) Levin Sewell
 Cooper Lewis (GA) Sherman
 Costa Lipinski Shuler
 Costello Loebsock Sires
 Courtney Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter
 Critz Lowey Smith (WA)
 Crowley Lujan Speier
 Cuellar Lynch Stark
 Cummings Maloney Sutton
 Davis (CA) Matheson Thompson (CA)
 Davis (IL) Matsui Thompson (MS)
 DeFazio McCarthy (NY) Tierney
 DeGette McCollum Tonko
 DeLauro McDermott Towns
 Dicks McGovern Tsongas
 Dingell McIntyre Van Hollen
 Doggett McNerney Velázquez
 Donnelly (IN) Meeks Visclosky
 Doyle Michaud Walz (MN)
 Edwards Miller (NC) Wasserman
 Ellison Miller, George Schultz
 Engel Moore Waters
 Eshoo Moran Watt
 Farr Murphy (CT) Waxman
 Fattah Nadler Welch
 Filner Napolitano Wilson (FL)
 Frank (MA) Neal Woolsey
 Fudge Oliver

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann Hirono Rangel
 Conyers Johnson (GA) Reichert
 Deutch Larson (CT) Yarmuth
 Giffords Markey
 Gohmert Paul

□ 1718

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2401, TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 406) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 184, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 723]

YEAS—237

Adams Crenshaw Harris
 Aderholt Culberson Hartzler
 Akin Davis (KY) Hastings (WA)
 Alexander Denham Hayworth
 Amash Dent Heck
 Amodei DesJarlais Hensarling
 Austria Diaz-Balart Herger
 Bachus Bachus Dold
 Barletta Barletta Dreier
 Bartlett Duffy Huelskamp
 Barton (TX) Duncan (SC) Hultgren
 Bass (NH) Duncan (TN) Hunter
 Benishek Ellmers Hurt
 Berg Emerson Issa
 Biggert Farenthold Jenkins
 Bilbray Bilbray Fincher
 Bilirakis Bilirakis Fitzpatrick
 Bishop (UT) Bishop (UT) Flake
 Black Fleischmann Johnson, Sam
 Blackburn Fleming Jordan
 Bonner Flores Kelly
 Bono Mack Forbes King (IA)
 Boustany Fortenberry King (NY)
 Brady (TX) Foxx Kingston
 Brooks Franks (AZ) Kinzinger (IL)
 Broun (GA) Frelinghuysen Kline
 Buchanan Gallegly Labrador
 Bucshon Gardner Lamborn
 Buerkle Garrett Lance
 Burgess Gerlach Lankford
 Burton (IN) Gibbs Latham
 Calvert Gibson LaTourette
 Camp Gingrey (GA) Latta
 Campbell Goodlatte Lewis (CA)
 Canseco Gosar LoBiondo
 Cantor Gowdy Long
 Capito Granger Lucas
 Carter Graves (GA) Luetkemeyer
 Cassidy Graves (MO) Lummis
 Chabot Griffin (AR) Lungren, Daniel
 Chaffetz Chaffetz E.
 Coble Grimm Mack
 Coffman (CO) Guinta Manzullo
 Cole Guthrie Marchant
 Conaway Hall Marino
 Cravaack Hanna McCarthy (CA)
 Crawford Harper McCaul

McClintock Reed
 McCotter Rehberg
 McHenry Renacci
 McKeon Ribble
 McKinley Rigell
 McMorris Rivera
 Rodgers Roby
 Meehan Roe (TN)
 Mica Rogers (AL)
 Miller (FL) Rogers (KY)
 Miller (MI) Rogers (MI)
 Miller, Gary Rohrabacher
 Mulvaney Rokita
 Murphy (PA) Rooney
 Myrick Ros-Lehtinen
 Neugebauer Roskam
 Noem Ross (FL)
 Nugent Royce
 Nunes Runyan
 Nunnelee Ryan (WI)
 Olson Scalise
 Palazzo Schilling
 Paulsen Schmidt
 Pearce Schock
 Pence Schweikert
 Petri Scott (SC)
 Pitts Scott, Austin
 Platts Sensenbrenner
 Poe (TX) Sessions
 Pompeo Shimkus
 Posey Shuler
 Price (GA) Shuster
 Quayle Simpson

NAYS—184

Ackerman Garamendi
 Altmire Gonzalez
 Andrews Green, Al
 Baca Green, Gene
 Baldwin Grijalva
 Barrow Gutierrez
 Bass (CA) Hahn
 Becerra Hanabusa
 Berkley Hastings (FL)
 Berman Heinrich
 Bishop (GA) Higgins
 Bishop (NY) Himes
 Blumenauer Hinchey
 Boren Hinojosa
 Boswell Hochul
 Brady (PA) Holden
 Braley (IA) Holt
 Brown (FL) Honda
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Inslee
 Capuano Israel
 Cardoza Jackson (IL)
 Carnahan Jackson Lee
 Carney (TX)
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chandler Kaptur
 Chu Keating
 Cicilline Kildee
 Clarke (MI) Kind
 Clarke (NY) Kissell
 Clay Kucinich
 Cleaver Langevin
 Clyburn Larsen (WA)
 Cohen Larson (CT)
 Connolly (VA) Lee (CA)
 Cooper Levin
 Costa Lewis (GA)
 Costello Lipinski
 Courtney Loeb sack
 Critz Lofgren, Zoe
 Crowley Lowey
 Cuellar Luján
 Cummings Lynch
 Davis (CA) Maloney
 Davis (IL) Markey
 DeFazio Matheson
 DeGette Matsui
 DeLauro McCarthy (NY)
 Dicks McCollum
 Dingell McDermott
 Doggett McGovern
 Donnelly (IN) McIntyre
 Doyle McNerney
 Edwards Meeks
 Ellison Michaud
 Engel Miller (NC)
 Eshoo Miller, George
 Farr Moore
 Fattah Moran
 Filner Murphy (CT)
 Frank (MA) Nadler
 Fudge Napolitano

Smith (NE) NOT VOTING—12
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

□ 1726
 So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 175, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 724]

AYES—245

Adams Fitzpatrick
 Aderholt Flake
 Akin Fleischmann
 Alexander Fleming
 Amash Flores
 Amodei Forbes
 Austria Fortenberry
 Bachus Poxx
 Barletta Franks (AZ)
 Bartlett Frelinghuysen
 Barton (TX) Gallegly
 Bass (NH) Gardner
 Benishek Garrett
 Berg Gerlach
 Biggert Gibbs
 Bilbray Gibson
 Bilirakis Gingrey (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Gohmert
 Black Gonzalez
 Blackburn Goodlatte
 Bonner Gosar
 Bono Mack Gowdy
 Boren Granger
 Boustany Graves (GA)
 Brady (TX) Graves (MO)
 Brooks Griffin (AR)
 Broun (GA) Griffith (VA)
 Buchanan Grimm
 Bucshon Guinta
 Buerkle Guthrie
 Burgess Hall
 Burton (IN) Hanna
 Calvert Harper
 Camp Harris
 Campbell Hartzler
 Canseco Hastings (WA)
 Cantor Hayworth
 Capito Heck
 Carter Hensarling
 Cassidy Herger
 Chabot Herrera Beutler
 Chaffetz Huelskamp
 Chandler Huizenga (MI)
 Coble Hultgren
 Coffman (CO) Hunter
 Cole Hurt
 Conaway Issa
 Costa Jenkins
 Cravaack Johnson (IL)
 Crawford Johnson (OH)
 Crenshaw Johnson, Sam
 Culberson Jones
 Davis (KY) Jordan
 Denham Kelly
 Dent King (IA)
 DesJarlais King (NY)
 Diaz-Balart Kingston
 Dold Kinzinger (IL)
 Dreier Kline
 Duffy Labrador
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn
 Duncan (TN) Lance
 Ellmers Landry
 Emerson Lankford
 Farenthold Latham
 Fincher LaTourette

Ross (FL) Smith (NE)
 Royce Smith (NJ)
 Runyan Smith (TX)
 Ryan (WI) Southerland
 Scalise Stearns
 Schilling Stivers
 Schmidt Stutzman
 Schock Sullivan
 Schweikert Terry
 Scott (SC) Thompson (PA)
 Scott, Austin Thornberry
 Sensenbrenner Tiberi
 Sessions Tipton
 Shimkus Turner (NY)
 Shuler Turner (OH)
 Shuster Upton
 Simpson Walberg

NOES—175

Ackerman Green, Al
 Altmire Green, Gene
 Andrews Grijalva
 Baca Gutierrez
 Baldwin Hahn
 Barrow Hanabusa
 Bass (CA) Hastings (FL)
 Becerra Heinrich
 Berkley Higgins
 Berman Himes
 Bishop (GA) Hinchey
 Bishop (NY) Hinojosa
 Boswell Hochul
 Brady (PA) Holden
 Braley (IA) Holt
 Brown (FL) Honda
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Inslee
 Capuano Israel
 Cardoza Jackson (IL)
 Carnahan Jackson Lee
 Carney (TX)
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clarke (MI) Kildee
 Clarke (NY) Kind
 Clay Kissell
 Cleaver Kucinich
 Clyburn Langevin
 Cohen Larsen (WA)
 Connolly (VA) Larson (CT)
 Cooper Lee (CA)
 Costello Levin
 Courtney Lewis (GA)
 Critz Lipinski
 Crowley Loeb sack
 Cuellar Lofgren, Zoe
 Cummings Lowey
 Davis (CA) Luján
 Davis (IL) Lynch
 DeFazio Maloney
 DeGette Markey
 DeLauro Matsui
 Dicks McCarthy (NY)
 Dingell McCollum
 Doggett McDermott
 Donnelly (IN) McGovern
 Doyle McNerney
 Edwards Meeks
 Ellison Michaud
 Engel Miller (NC)
 Eshoo Miller, George
 Farr Moore
 Fattah Moran
 Filner Murphy (CT)
 Frank (MA) Nadler
 Fudge Napolitano
 Garamendi Neal

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann Hirono
 Blumenauer Marchant
 Conyers Palazzo
 Deutch Paul
 Giffords Rangel

□ 1735

Oliver Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rothman (NJ)
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 411

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Hahn, to rank immediately after Mr. Richmond.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2401.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 406 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2401.

□ 1738

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The last time the Clean Air Act was significantly changed was in 1990, nearly 21 years ago, and since that time, a lot of changes have occurred in America. First of all, we find ourselves today with a situation where over 14 million Americans are unable to find work and millions more have given up trying. It appears that the only place where the job situation is good is at Federal regulatory agencies. Employment at Federal regulatory agencies

has climbed 13 percent since President Obama took office, while private sector jobs shrank by 5.6 percent. I believe these two divergent trends are related because the breaking pace at which the Environmental Protection Agency is cranking out new regulations is creating obstacles to job creation in America, and also to stimulating the economy.

I don't care if you speak to small business people today or large business people today, they will tell you that one of the reasons that they are not investing is because of uncertainty—uncertainty about the health care bill that was passed last year, uncertainty about the financial regulations that are raising capital requirements and making loans more difficult to obtain, but primarily they talk about the excessive regulations coming out of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Now, these regulations normally are not scrutinized very much, but I believe that the legislative branch has the responsibility, particularly when this many regulations are coming down the road, at a time when it's having impact on our ability to grow the economy, that the legislative branch needs to look at it, and that's precisely what we're doing with the TRAIN Act.

□ 1740

Under the TRAIN Act, we are establishing a government body that will look at the cumulative impact of about 12 regulations that have come down from the EPA in the last year or so. For example, there are a number of costly new rules impacting coal-fired electric power plants. These include utility MACT, Cross-State Air Pollution Rules, greenhouse gas rules, coal combustion residuals, and others.

Each of these rules, alone, will force some existing power plants to shut down, while also blocking new ones from being built. This is bad enough, not just for jobs, but also because it will raise electricity prices. But the combined effect of all these rules is far worse. In fact, it could even reduce generating capacity enough that it would jeopardize the reliability of the Nation's electric grid system. And we need to know all of the information that we can obtain about these regulations so that we can move forward in a legitimate and conscientious way.

If America is going to remain competitive in the global marketplace, it is going to have to have reasonable electricity prices, and that's going to be essential if we're ever going to stimulate this economy and create jobs in America.

The cumulative burden of regulations really has not been much of a burden in the past because it's seldom that EPA has ever come forth with this many regulations. But the Obama administration's attempt to squeeze at least a decade's worth of major Clean Air Act regulations into less than 3 years, and do so in the midst of a weak economy, creates serious problems for America.

The TRAIN Act, which really is very simple, will require an analysis of the cumulative impacts of the listed rules on energy prices and reliability, on jobs, and the effect on American competitiveness.

Two upcoming rules that pose a particularly serious threat and are a major component of EPA's agenda are the utility MACT and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. For these two rules, we will be offering an amendment that would put them on hold, pending completion of the cumulative impact study, as well as make substantive changes to make sure that they are achievable in real life.

I might point out that the utility MACT is not in effect yet. The final rule is expected in November of this year. But the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule is in effect, and they'll start implementing it the first of the year.

We're going to ask that that implementation be delayed until the final rule of our committee that's established under the TRAIN Act makes its final report on August 1, 2012.

Some people are saying, well, if you delay this, then what are we going to do about our air transport rule? Well, the reality is that we have an air transport rule in effect today. I might add that EPA, when they implemented this bill, the CAIR Act, which was invalidated by a Federal court, showed that the SO₂ emissions, the NO_x emissions would be reduced significantly. And just about every environmental group in America supported the implementation of CAIR.

I might also say that with CAIR, at that time, EPA came out with one of their benefit analyses, and they said CAIR will result in \$85 billion to \$100 billion in health benefits each year, preventing 17,000 premature deaths, 22,000 nonfatal heart attacks, 22,300 hospital admissions, 1.7 million workdays, 500,000 lost schooldays. What we have in place today is doing a tremendous job; and until a court invalidated it, everyone was pleased with it. And so there's little reason for us to rush forward to put in a new air transport rule when we have one that is working fine today.

I might also say, some people have criticized this by trying to look at the cumulative impact of all these 12 or 13 regulations that EPA has implemented, but I would point out that President Obama, in his Executive Order 13563, said: I'm asking people in my administration to tailor regulations to impose the least burden on society, taking into account other things, including the cost of cumulative regulations.

So this legislation, which some people are going to describe as radical, is simply implementing what President Obama has asked his Environmental Protection Agency to do, and yet they refuse to do it.

With that, I do hope that people will support H.R. 2401. It's a commonsense approach to remove regulations that

are prohibiting jobs from being created in America and stimulating the American economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This week is Dirty Air Week in the House of Representatives. Yesterday, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we considered legislation that will increase emissions of mercury and other dangerous chemicals from industrial sources. Today the full House considers legislation to cut the heart out of the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most anti-environmental House of Representatives in history. Since February of this year, the House has voted again and again to block action to address climate change, to halt efforts to reduce air and water pollution, to undermine protections for public lands in coastal areas, and to weaken the protection of the environment in other ways.

My staff prepared a database last month on every anti-environmental vote in this Congress. The tally was 125—125 votes to weaken clean air, clean water, safeguards to make our drinking water less safe, to weaken environmental standards in dozens of different ways. This is an appalling and dangerous environmental record. The full database is online at democrats.energycommerce.house.gov.

Today the assault continues on the Clean Air Act. The bill we consider today, the TRAIN Act, will block and indefinitely delay two EPA rules that reduce pollution from power plants: the Mercury and Air Toxics Rule and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. These rules are critical to protecting the public health. Each year these rules will prevent tens of thousands of premature deaths, tens of thousands of heart attacks, and hundreds of thousands of asthma attacks. They will also prevent over 2 million lost workdays. If this legislation is enacted, these public health benefits will be lost, and more babies will be born with birth defects and learning disabilities.

And this is not all. Today we will consider amendments offered by Chairman WHITFIELD and Representative LATTA that will make this bill even worse. The Whitfield amendment will eviscerate the law's ability to require power plants to install modern pollution controls.

EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson told us this morning that if the Whitfield amendment is enacted, EPA will never be able to issue a rule to prevent emissions from power plants in one State from polluting the air in a downwind State. She also said that the amendment could destroy the agency's ability to ever reduce toxic mercury emissions from power plants.

The Latta amendment is even worse. It will reverse 40 years of clean air policy, repealing the health-based standards that are at the heart of the Clean Air Act. The Latta amendment would allow our national goals for clean air

to be determined by corporate profits, not public health.

□ 1750

These radical amendments were never examined in hearings or debated in the Energy and Commerce Committee or in any other committee. Members are being asked to vote on major changes to the Clean Air Act without any idea of their terrible impact on air quality and public health.

My Republican colleagues will argue that we need to gut the Clean Air Act because it is a job-killing law. That is categorically false. The last 40 years proved we could have both economic growth and a clean environment. We do not have to choose between jobs and toxic mercury emissions that endanger our children's health and poison our lakes.

The rules that are being overturned are job creators. If these rules are allowed to go forward, the utilities that operate our oldest and dirtiest power plants will have to install new pollution controls. This will create 1.5 million jobs by 2015. This bill puts these jobs on the chopping block.

I urge all Members to oppose this legislation and protect the Clean Air Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might just say first of all that I would tell Mrs. Jackson that we are not preventing her from implementing new air transport rules. We're going to keep in place what we have today that EPA said was a splendid program and even defended it in the court system. If my amendment is adopted, 3 years after the final report is made, they're totally free to go in and implement a new rule.

At this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the vice chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2401, the Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act of 2011, otherwise known as the TRAIN Act.

As House Republicans move forward with a bold agenda to grow our economy and put Americans back to work, one area that must be addressed is the issue of overregulation by the Federal Government.

I strongly believe the Obama administration is moving too fast and showing little regard for the economic consequences of their energy and environmental policies. They are trying to regulate what they don't have the votes to legislate, and it is going to cost Americans jobs.

With our Nation suffering under a crushing weight of 9 percent unemployment and the fact that the United States failed to create a single job in the month of August, the stakes could not be higher. The simple fact is that the businesses make decisions on where to invest based upon a number of factors, but regulatory certainty ranks at the top of the list.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation to protect American jobs, jobs

that we are in danger of losing due to the Obama administration's environmental regulatory agenda. The TRAIN Act will force the EPA and other Federal agencies to conduct an in-depth economic analysis of several of their rules and regulations so Congress and the American people can fully understand how the EPA's regulatory train wreck will impact our economy.

In fact, EPA's rules and actions addressed in this legislation cost billions of dollars to the U.S. economy. The time to address the full economic burden of these regulations is now.

At its heart, the TRAIN Act simply asks questions that should be asked of any expensive regulation: What do these regulations mean for our ability to compete in the global marketplace? Will electricity prices climb and by how much as power producers are required to retrofit plants to meet new requirements? How would higher electricity prices and plant closures affect jobs in the U.S.?

It's really astonishing that the EPA is not doing this already. It is just common sense, good government for American workers and businesses.

Now, some of the opponents of this commonsense legislation, including President Obama, say that this legislation is an assault on the Clean Air Act. Nothing could be further from the truth. The TRAIN Act will not prevent EPA from continuing to develop regulations. The TRAIN Act will also not limit the EPA's authority to protect public health and welfare in any way. The fact is EPA has never done an analysis on the cumulative impacts of these regulations on global competitiveness, energy and fuel prices, employment, or reliability of electricity supply, which is why we need this legislation.

As we can see by EPA's actions on the utility sector alone, they are issuing multiple regulations on top of each other at an accelerated rate that makes it difficult for companies to invest and create jobs. I'm pleased that we include language to delay EPA's action on both the Utility MACT and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule until 6 months after the TRAIN Act analysis is complete.

The Utility MACT Rule alone has the potential to be EPA's most expensive rule impacting the U.S. economy. And when combined, these proposed rules could cost almost \$18 billion to implement as a result and cause a net employment loss of 1,450,000 jobs by 2020. These rules are an example of EPA's regulatory train wreck in action.

In addition, one of the actions in my bill that we study is the regional haze issue, which greatly impacts my State of Oklahoma, as this is yet another example of EPA's overreaching on the States with burdensome regulations without analyzing its impact on electric reliability or cost. This EPA action alone is expected to cost \$2 billion to Oklahoma businesses and electric rate payers.

If there is one thing that can help our struggling economy, it is having access to stable and reliable sources of energy.

In these tough economic times, I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this common-sense measure.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the fine ranking member of the full committee, Mr. WAXMAN, for his outstanding leadership on this matter and other matters before our committee and before this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I join my friend and colleague, Ranking Member WAXMAN, in his declaration that this week should be known as Dirty Air Week in America based on the Republican legislative agenda.

The so-called TRAIN Act is really a train wreck for the air we breathe, the environment we live in, and the jobs we need. Just yesterday in a full Energy and Commerce Committee markup, my Republican colleagues on a mostly party-line vote favorably passed out two bills that would delay the Obama administration's new rules for industrial boilers and cement kilns—H.R. 2250 and H.R. 2681, respectively.

These two bills would delay the toxic emissions limits for both boilers and cement kilns, two of the largest emissions sources that lack Federal standards and permanently weaken the Clean Air Act so that the EPA will be forced to issue weaker standards for these polluting facilities than the law currently requires.

Now today, we're here debating the Train Wreck Act, which would delay for at least 3 years the implementation of two new U.S. EPA rules for power plants: the newly finalized Cross-State Air Pollution Rule for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, and a soon-to-be finalized rule for hazardous toxic emissions.

□ 1800

With Republicans holding the majority in the House of Representatives, we know that the TRAIN Act will ultimately collide with the health of the American people. It's going to pass this Chamber even though the cross-State rule alone would prevent 34,000 deaths in this Nation and 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma annually.

Mr. Chairman, since the new Republican majority took control of the Energy and Commerce Committee and this Congress, they have been on a relentless crusade against our environmental protection laws, and they have been trying to portray the EPA as public enemy number one.

According to the logic of today's Republican Party, agencies such as the EPA, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the Allergy and Asthma Founda-

tion of America, and the Physicians for Social Responsibility are all actually enemies of the American people and American jobs because they oppose this radical new Republican agenda and because they advocate for policies that regulate the number of toxins and poisons that we allow industry to emit into the air each and every moment of the day.

I must remind my Republican colleagues that EPA stands for the Environmental Protection Agency and not the Evil Practices Agency, as they would have us believe.

My Republican colleagues would have the American people believe that, if Congress just gets out of industry's way and allows corporations to operate unregulated and unfettered, then they will inevitably do the right thing for the American people. The majority party also wants us to believe that we should not place standards or rules on industry because the inherent benevolence of corporations will ultimately lead them to do the right thing for the American people.

But just think of the recent past. Let me remind my Republican colleagues that this philosophy has been tested under the previous Bush administration, and it has totally failed. It has failed the American people. It has failed the American environment. It has failed the American air that we breathe.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. RUSH. We don't have to look any further. Just look at the financial collapse and see what these kinds of unfettered regulations have done to jobs in this country and to jobs for the American people. This approach has put our entire economy on the brink of disaster.

After a financial collapse, here you are today, trying to bring forth a collapse in terms of environmental protections—a collapse in terms of protecting us by changing the air that we breathe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this egregious and dangerous bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHE-SON), who is a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MATHE-SON. I want to thank my colleague from Kentucky for allowing me the time.

I think, as we look at the TRAIN Act today, you're going to hear a lot during this debate from both sides of the aisle; and there are going to be a lot of strong words from both sides of the aisle, probably beyond what the TRAIN Act really is.

The TRAIN Act was an idea: that we ought to take a look before we leap. The idea that we have all these processes taking place on individual rules, but that no one is bothering to take a

look at how they all might fit together and what the impacts might be just doesn't make sense. That was the genesis behind this bill: to make sure that we look at the overall impact. You see, the EPA is supposed to look at the impacts on each individual rule, but they don't look at how they connect together.

The Clean Air Act has been a wonderful success in this country. It has made a lot of progress, and I think everyone in this room appreciates the health benefits it has created. It has also made a lot of progress on a lot of different criteria pollutants. Now we're taking on and addressing issues that reflect some of the more difficult issues to address at smaller increments at the upper end. As we're going to do that, I would suggest it makes sense for us to make sure that before we take actions that could have great significance that we at least understand that significance.

So that's the idea behind the TRAIN Act—look before you leap, and make sure how all of this fits together.

Despite what this debate sounds like for people watching tonight, there is a common agenda here among everyone. I think most people in this country value clean air. They value good decision-making, too, and we want to make sure that we evaluate these issues with the best analysis possible and with the best information possible so we can make decisions in the most efficient way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased and honored to yield 5 minutes to one of the strongest environmental champions in the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the Republican TRAIN Act, the Total Regulatory Amnesty for Industry Negligence Act of 2011.

The very silly premise of this bill is that it's simply impossible to keep our air clean and still keep our economic engine chugging along. This Republican-led House has initiated a full-throttle "repeal-a-thon." It's a three-part strategy: one, deny the science; two, delay the regulations; three, deter efforts to protect the health and security of millions of Americans.

We keep hearing from Republicans about how EPA's clean air standards to reduce mercury, lead, dioxins, and other pollutants need to be economically analyzed and reanalyzed. They insist that, even if a standard for one toxic chemical was met by an entire industrial sector, the removal of just one more poisonous chemical would cause a domino effect of problems for industry.

And the solution to these supposed problems? It is a time-tested Republican tradition.

First, pass legislation that repeals regulations that have already been set. Two, require endless study of the cumulative effects of all regulations of

all industries. Finally, just for good measure, pass an amendment that guts the very underpinnings of the Clean Air Act.

Make no mistake, that is what we are doing here today.

Our planet is warming and extreme weather is increasing. We're having record 100-year floods every few years. Hurricanes have caused floods, massive power outages, and deaths. Texas was on fire this summer after having the warmest summer ever recorded by any State. The President has issued disaster declarations in 48 States so far this year. We have set an all-time high of 83 major disasters declared in 2011. We've already had 10 weather events causing \$1 billion or more in damages—another record—and we still have 3 months of the year left to go.

And what do Republicans propose?

Rather than saving money by cutting the hundreds of billions we spent on unneeded Cold War-era nuclear weapons, the Tea Party chooses to cut funds that would reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Rather than cutting the tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies we give to Big Oil and Big Coal, the Republicans gut programs that would manufacture energy-efficient cars in America and provide clean air. Republicans would have us pay for the costs of weather disasters caused by global warming by cutting funding for a program that actually reduces the very threat of global warming.

For all the talk of this so-called "TRAIN wreck of cumulative EPA regulations," there seems to be one cumulative effect that isn't getting mentioned by the Republicans: the cumulative effect of all of their goals on the health of Americans. That is because the Republicans, perhaps, are spending so much time doing the bidding of those corporations that they have lost their train of thought.

If the regulation to remove mercury from cement plants—already 13 years overdue—is delayed for even one more year, up to 2,500 people will prematurely die. There will be 17,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1,500 people will suffer heart attacks. If the regulation to remove mercury, lead, and cancer-causing toxins from incinerators and industrial boilers—already 11 years overdue—is delayed for one more year, there will be 6,600 people who will prematurely die because of that.

□ 1810

Additionally, if this bill passes, it would repeal mercury and Cross-State Air Pollution Rules for power plants, resulting in the loss of 25,000 more lives and more than 11,000 heart attacks. And that's just with 1 year of delay.

So what's the cumulative impact of just 1 year of delay on each of these regulations? Thirty-four thousand people will die and many more will be injured.

In discussing these Republican efforts, today, Lisa Jackson, EPA Ad-

ministrator, testified before our committee that, "If we could reduce particulate matter to healthy levels, it would have the same impact as finding the cure for cancer in our country." The difference is we already know how to reduce particulate matter. We don't know how to cure cancer.

The Republicans are providing the American people with a false choice. We do not have to choose between air quality and air-conditioning. We do not have to choose between manufacturing and mercury poisoning. We do not have to choose between clean air and cancer. Ending protections for clean air and clean water should be a third rail issue, but the Republican Tea Party express has veered far off onto the right track.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Sadly, these are the kinds of anti-innovation, anti-science, anti-public health schemes the public has come to fear from this legislative wrecking crew.

When the Republicans beckon you to come "all aboard" on the TRAIN Act, I urge you to run in the opposite direction, because the only train Republicans seem to care about is the Big Oil and big coal gravy train, and that's pulling out of the station here tonight as the Republicans push this bill through the Congress.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, there is nothing in the TRAIN Act that would delay for 1 day the greenhouse gas regulations that EPA adopted last January. There is nothing in this bill relating to the Cement MACT as well.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, I knew that I was going to speak on this important legislation, and I tried to find the words that I would use this evening. And while I was attempting to do that, I came across a letter to the editor in the Virginian Leader in Giles County, Virginia, that was published yesterday, September 21, 2011, and sent in by John and Eleanor Kinney. They are described in their letter as an American blue collar worker. Neither Republican nor Democrat do they support. In that letter, I will quote parts of it, they say:

"I'm going to be very blunt with the following opinion: As a factory worker and taxpayer, I'm getting sick and tired of these Federal agencies who have nothing better to do except sit in their Washington offices and draw up rules and regulations to kill American jobs. Why don't they get off their sorry behinds and go out across this Nation and try to help industry save what jobs we have left? And who is paying these EPA people's salary? We are, the American workers. I believe in protecting

the environment, but we can't shut the whole country down to achieve it."

Mr. and Mrs. Kinney of Narrows, Virginia, go on:

"I hope that anyone who agrees will write, email, or call all of our elected officials in Washington, D.C. Tell them the EPA is not living in the real world, and that it's time to put some 'regulations' on them and how they can dictate rules to what industry we are still hanging on to in this Nation. In a time of recession and Americans out of work, they should be helping industry, not trying to close what manufacturing base we have left with these idiotic rules and regulations."

Hear, hear, Mr. and Mrs. Kinney. Hear, hear.

This bill that we are debating tonight does exactly what you asked us to do. We are doing your bidding, and the millions of Americans out there who feel the same way you do, that it's high time we put some regulations and some constraints on the regulators in Washington who don't know what it's like to have to work for a living, who don't know what it's like not knowing whether or not the particular business in your community is going to stay open.

These folks are particularly concerned in their discussion about a plant there in Giles County, one of the largest employers there that is in danger if we don't change some of the rules proposed by the EPA. They are concerned about announced layoffs in Giles County, Virginia, as a result of EPA regulations that will cause the power plant there at Glen Lyn to close down.

So, ladies and gentlemen, don't be fooled by the folks who say we are doing the bidding of Big Oil and Big Coal. We are doing the bidding of people like Mr. and Mrs. John and Eleanor Kinney.

I don't know the Kinneys, but I sure do look forward to getting to meet them, because that's the kind of people who made America great. And with a bill like this, we can continue to keep America great.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my fellow Californian, an important member of the Health Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I express my strong opposition to this bill that will dismantle public health standards and safeguards and increase air pollution.

The TRAIN Act may have started as a "study," but it has transformed into a fundamentally different beast. It will neither create jobs nor stimulate the economy. Instead, the TRAIN Act indefinitely blocks the EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. These are designed to protect our children and our families from dangerous pollutants.

We know that blocking these standards will lead to tens of thousands of premature deaths every single year. It

will lead to more heart attacks, more respiratory illnesses, more children in the hospital hooked up to respirators. The TRAIN Act means more exposure to toxic mercury as well, a brain poison that causes developmental disorders, especially in small children and the unborn.

But, Mr. Chairman, the TRAIN Act will also hurt the economy. It will make it harder for families to make ends meet. It will force Americans to miss millions of days of work each year in order to care for sick family members or themselves.

It will waste billions of taxpayer dollars treating preventable illnesses and disease caused by pollution, which could have been prevented. And it will saddle families and businesses with out-of-pocket medical costs and higher insurance premiums.

That's what the TRAIN Act is really about, blocking the EPA from ridding our air of pollutants that cause asthma attacks, respiratory illnesses among children, heart disease, and premature deaths. And the other side of the aisle wants to make it worse than it already is.

Later today, Mr. WHITFIELD will offer an amendment that imposes even longer mandatory delays on EPA's two lifesaving clean air standards, and it would rewrite the Clean Air Act to reverse the way toxic air pollution standards are set. Instead of basing standards on the cleanest plants, the standards would be based on what the oldest and dirtiest plants are doing. Today Administrator Jackson testified that this change alone would make it impossible to ever issue a cross-State pollution standard.

Another amendment, led by Mr. LATTI, would invert the Clean Air Act's 40-year-old requirement that EPA set its clean air standards on health science and medicine alone. His amendment would eliminate that right, which Americans depend upon.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on these dangerous amendments because Americans don't want millions of tons of toxic pollution dumped into their lungs. They want jobs, and they aren't fooled that they need to pay for those jobs with more pollution. They want a stronger economy, not increased health care costs and suffering. And, most importantly, they want their children to breathe the clean and safe air.

I urge my colleagues vote "no" on this bill.

□ 1820

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might say to the gentlelady from California, the air transport rule we have in effect today, when it was implemented, EPA said it would reduce SO_x and NO_x by 73 and 57 percent by the year 2015. So it's not like we don't have something already in place.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our Republican col-

leagues for giving us time to speak on this important bill.

As we've discussed, H.R. 2401, the underlying bill, is one that is important and appropriate that we consider at this time. I support the underlying legislation. And also as my colleague, Congressman MATHESON stated, while it's okay to have strong feelings on this measure, it's not appropriate to overstate in fact what this legislation does.

This measure requires the creation of an interagency committee to study the effects of the current and proposed regulations put forth by the Environmental Protection Agency that together have major effects not only on our way of life but on our economy, our economy which at this point in time is in a very fragile recovery period.

For too long, constituents that I represent, farmers, farm workers and small businesses in the San Joaquin Valley, have had to shoulder the burden of mounting regulations of the EPA. They've worked hard to meet stricter standards, and we're making progress. We've made great progress in cleaning up the air quality in the valley, even while the population is growing more rapidly than any other place in the State. Yet common sense must prevail. At some point it's time to put the brakes on regulations and understand the effects on consumers, on energy, on manufacturing industries, on electricity, on fuel prices, and our country's competitiveness in the global market.

Recently, the administration has acknowledged that many regulations are having an effect on our economy. It's time that they step up to the plate and work with the Congress for common sense to prevail.

I thank Congressmen MATHESON and SULLIVAN for introducing this important measure, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it. It's not an either/or choice. We can have clean air and we can have a good, commonsense decision-making process. The two are not mutually exclusive, as some of my colleagues are suggesting. I urge that you vote for this measure. It's a commonsense way to work through these difficult issues.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, I want to indicate that Mr. WHITFIELD just argued that this bill will not harm public health because although it blocks two critical rules to clean up old power plants, it doesn't repeal the Clean Air Interstate Rule, or the CAIR rule. Well, leaving an inadequate rule in place does not achieve the health benefits lost by blocking the Mercury Air Toxics Rule and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. The CAIR rule was blocked by the courts. They found it didn't comply with the Clean Air Act because it did not effectively address pollution that crosses State lines. That means that States suffering from up-wind pollution have to look for additional, more costly, pollution reductions from smaller local sources;

and it does not require power plants to clean up mercury and other toxic air pollution. His statement was absolutely incorrect.

At this time I want to yield 3 minutes to a very important member of our committee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY from the State of Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The majority's assault on clean air continues and has culminated into what my friend and colleague, Mr. WAXMAN, has rightly referred to as Dirty Air Week.

The effort to further delay EPA from protecting our air would damage our environment and the health of our citizens. Today, 60 percent of Americans live in areas where air pollution has reached unhealthy levels. The health care costs associated with air pollution are estimated at over \$100 billion annually. But these statistics would be even worse without the protections of the Clean Air Act. According to the American Lung Association, Clean Air Act regulations prevented over 160,000 premature deaths in 2010.

Over the past 20 years, the EPA estimates that the Clean Air Act prevented 21,000 cases of heart disease, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 843,000 asthma attacks, and 18 million child respiratory illnesses.

Yet today we consider a bill the Natural Resource's Defense Council has deemed the deadliest bill on the Republican agenda. The goal of the TRAIN Act is to undermine EPA's ability to protect our citizens from dangerous toxins through the dismantling of the Mercury and Air Toxics and Cross-State air pollution standards.

As a mother and a grandmother, I have been a long-time advocate of clean air practices, especially with regard to mercury.

Mercury threatens public health, but is particularly dangerous to pregnant women and children. Overexposure to mercury inhibits a developing child's ability to walk, talk, read, write, and comprehend and is one of the most dangerous unregulated toxins, which is why I led legislation in the last Congress to curb mercury emissions from various facilities.

In my home State of Illinois, coal-fired power plants emitted almost 5,000 pounds of mercury into the atmosphere in 2009, making Illinois the seventh most mercury-polluted State in the Nation. But while Illinois has taken steps to reduce mercury contamination, air pollution doesn't stop at State borders. Federal standards are needed to ensure that every State makes a good-faith effort to protect its residents.

The Mercury and Air Toxics Standards will prevent 4,500 cases of acute bronchitis and 6,800 premature deaths. And the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule will prevent 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma and 34,000 deaths per year.

My colleagues across the aisle claim to be in the business of eliminating

burdens. But by my math, every year these regulations are delayed, over 40,000 preventable deaths will occur. And as much as Republican opponents to the EPA would like to disagree, these rules, like the previous Clean Air Act regulations, will grow our economy.

Earlier this year, the Political Economy Research Institute concluded that the Cross-State and Mercury and Air Toxics rules will drive investments that could create 300,000 new jobs annually. The Mercury and Toxics Air Standard alone is expected to generate \$7 billion in annual GDP growth. The numbers are clearly in favor of the Clean Air Act and I reject the Republican idea that Americans need to choose between jobs and health. The proven good news is that we can do both.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The bipartisan position, the one that both parties working together have put forward, is to support this; and we've had different comments about the Republicans are doing this or that. But the truth of the matter is this is a bipartisan bill. It's a bipartisan bill that our country needs because for 2½ years bureaucrats at the Environmental Protection Agency have run wild with new regulations while hiding the staggering job losses that would result.

The TRAIN Act requires an inter-agency committee to study the actual economic effects of EPA regulations and make the findings public. Most of us say that's a commonsense request of EPA, no more regulations until we know how many jobs will be lost.

Mr. Chairman, I have a manufacturing background, and I come from a manufacturing State. In Kentucky, we know what it takes to keep and grow jobs, and it isn't excess regulations from EPA. I implore my colleagues to pass the TRAIN Act and shed light on the havoc that this agency is causing for job creators nationwide. A vote for this bill is a vote for jobs and for transparency.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from the State of Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, for too long too many people in this body have proposed that we must make what amounts to a devil's bargain: choosing between environmental protections and jobs. Today, the ideology behind that false choice brings us to the brink of gutting one of our Nation's fundamental laws, the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Chairman, the Clean Air Act has safeguarded our economy and our families' health for decades. And despite heated rhetoric from the other side, it does not stand in the way of creating jobs. In 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act prevented 160,000 premature deaths, 3 million lost school days, and 13 million lost workdays.

□ 1830

By 2020, the Clean Air Act's total benefit to the economy will reach \$2 trillion, outweighing the costs by 30-1. But despite the actual numbers, today we find ourselves debating a full attack on clean air—through the TRAIN Act—which would represent an unprecedented upheaval of our long-held pollution standards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a 3-hour hearing in my committee, the Oversight Subcommittee, today talking about the alleged job loss that the majority claims would happen. I heard no—repeat no—evidence that these rules would cause a job loss. In fact, the evidence put into the record at the hearing showed that these regulations will create jobs at the same time they are preserving our citizens' health.

A key amendment to this act, which will be introduced later by Mr. WHITFIELD and which was accepted during the committee markup, is a dangerous measure that would indefinitely block two major Clean Air Act regulations. First, the Utility MACT rule, reducing mercury and other toxic emissions from power plants, and also the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, reducing sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from power plants. Both of these rules are being developed after extensive cost benefit analyses.

Together, the two rules would prevent more than 50,000 premature deaths per year across the country. Now why would we delay implementation of the rules based solely on letters from constituents and anecdotal evidence? In fact, these two critical federal regulations correspond to successful pollution regulations in my home State of Colorado that are already bringing positive results for our State.

Now everybody in this Chamber knows the natural beauty of Colorado is a treasure for everyone to enjoy. People move there because of the clean air and safe water. It is also a primary driver in our economy through natural resources development and tourism. But because of mercury emissions from power plants, cement kilns, refineries, and commercial boilers, about 20 percent of our pristine lakes and reservoirs contain mercury-tainted fish, including in our alpine areas.

To combat that, Colorado has adopted some of the most stringent mercury rules in the country, with regulations on the books to cut mercury emissions by 80 percent by 2012 and 90 percent by 2018. These State regulations have been implemented successfully and to our collective economic benefit—a federal overlay to such regulations would bring the benefits that we have in States like Colorado to the entire Nation.

Colorado also has been a leader in cutting sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions to our economic and environmental benefit. While some States had a tough time designing haze-reduction plans in response to the Bush administration's now-defunct

Clean Air Interstate Rule, Colorado didn't wait. We knew that we could clean up our power plants and also the power the economy.

So in 2010, Colorado enacted the Clean Energy Clean Jobs Act. The law calls for utilities to reduce haze-causing emissions of sulfur dioxide by about 80 percent and nitrogen oxide by about 85 percent. As a result, Colorado's largest utility, Xcel Energy, is on track to shutter four coal-powered plants, three in Denver, and replace that generation with natural gas-powered units. It will also install emissions controls for another 951 megawatts of coal-fired electrical generation. And, Mr. Chairman, Xcel expects that these improvements will only increase rates by 2 percent annually over the next 10 years.

Colorado's successful experience with these types of regulations stands as even further proof that effective and efficient regulations to protect our air and water bring ever growing benefits to our Nation. And blocking these regulations is a dangerous game where America's families will pay the price.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of these amendments will fundamentally rewrite our approaches to the Clean Air Act regulations that have been the gold standard of our environmental laws since 1990.

I urge rejection of the amendments, and I urge rejection of this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I certainly have great respect for the gentlelady from Colorado, whom I've had the opportunity to work with on a lot of issues, but I would say to her and to others the only regulation that we're delaying relating to mercury is the Utility MACT. And I might say that EPA said that the health benefits from the reduction of mercury because of the Utility MACT was so insignificant that they did not even include it as a benefit.

At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be some funny accounting at the Environmental Protection Agency. EPA justifies issuing major rules that will have a tremendous negative impact on our economy by relying on the concept of "lives saved from premature death." Well, let's take a look at those "lives saved" numbers.

Ninety percent of the 13,000 to 34,000 theoretical "lives saved" from the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule are from particulate matter exposures already below the National Air Ambient Quality Standard. Ninety percent of the 6,000 to 17,000 theoretical "lives saved" from the Utility MACT are from particulate matter exposures already below the National Air Ambient Quality Standard.

Do you notice the theme? The EPA should explain how they attribute a

net benefit to a concentration of particulate matter below their own standards.

I encourage Members to vote “yes” on the TRAIN Act, H.R. 2401, to hold the EPA accountable, and to put a stop to this job-killing nonsense.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. WHITFIELD, just said that the EPA found that the mercury reduction benefits were so insignificant by EPA. Well, what they found was they couldn't put a pricetag on the avoided birth defects and brain damage to babies. If that's insignificant, I just think people ought to put this whole effort to deregulate the efforts to protect the environment in perspective. I think the Republicans think it's insignificant because we can't put a dollar figure on birth defects and brain damage to an infant—and so many Republicans call themselves pro-life.

I want to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee who has fought so hard to protect environmental regulations, especially those that protect the public health, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. WAXMAN for his constant, credible leadership. He is saying what all Americans should be aware of. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation. Mr. Chairman, power plants emit 96,000 pounds of mercury into the air we breathe every year. Yet this bill would prevent EPA from regulating mercury.

Mercury is an extremely dangerous neurotoxin. It damages children's developing brains, reducing their IQ and their ability to learn. At low levels of exposure, it causes insomnia, neuromuscular changes, headaches, disturbances in sensations, changes in nerve responses and impairment of cognitive functions. Hundreds of thousands of people have been affected in this way. But at higher exposures, it affects kidneys, causes respiratory failure and death.

One gram of mercury, a tiny drop, can be enough to contaminate 200 million gallons of water, which is the size of a 20-acre, 30-foot deep lake. All but one State, Alaska, have issued health advisories warning their residents against eating fish caught in their waters because of mercury contamination. It goes up in the air from the power plants, then when it rains, it goes into the water, it poisons the fish, and ultimately it poisons human beings. Two States, Oklahoma and Maine, have issued Statewide fresh water advisories that you should be wary of eating any large fish due to the possibility of mercury poisoning.

Think of this: Despite this acknowledged danger, each year, power plants release 96,000 pounds of mercury into the air.

EPA's proposed Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule requires power plants to meet the same requirements

that other industries have already met using proven emission control technologies that will reduce mercury emissions by 91 percent. It can be done. And the cost of meeting both regulations pales in comparison to the economic benefits Americans will receive with cleaner air.

□ 1840

The proposed Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule has a quantified benefit of between 5 and 13 times its cost. And the pollution reductions required by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule will yield benefits of \$120 billion to \$280 billion per year, which is between 150 to 350 times its cost.

This bill serves the interest of no one but a few CEOs and the politicians who are supported by them, who refuse to accept responsibility for the harm their unregulated power plants have imposed on the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, this bill itself is deliberately deceiving. In fact, the title of the bill implies something that is not true. The Environmental Protection Agency is fully transparent, and it has already performed a Regulatory Impact Analysis on the cost of its Clean Air Act regulations. And the intent of the bill is not what it claims. The true intent of this bill is to slow down or block implementation of EPA's obligations under the law to regulate our environment. It specifically suspends further action on two regulations—the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and the proposed rule on Mercury and Air Toxics Standards—that are required under the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990.

Pass this bill and you will condemn tens of thousands of Americans to a premature death, you will sentence millions more to a lifetime of health complications, and you will straddle our economy with unnecessary costs and employers with millions of additional sick days.

The goal of a cleaner environment and a healthier population should not be sacrificed in order to keep this Nation's dirtiest power plants from doing what almost every other industry and all governments have done to reduce harmful air pollution.

What we're being given here is a false choice peddled by, as I say, a fraction of CEOs in the utility industry who refuse to clean up their antiquated coal-fired power plants.

We can have clear air and more jobs. History provides us with proof it is possible because it has already happened. Hundreds of thousands of people owe their life today to the environmental movement and leaders in Congress like Mr. WAXMAN and the White House who pushed for and passed the landmark environmental laws—back in the 1970s in the Nixon administration, and in 1990—that required polluters to clean our waters and reduce the pollution in the air we breathe. In the decade after the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments were signed into law by George H.W. Bush,

our unemployment declined, our economy grew, and we reduced acid rain-forming gases by more than 30 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman. I want you to listen to this, Mr. Chairman. The cost of meeting the

emission reductions was actually 75 percent less than what EPA had originally predicted in 1990, and it was far below what opponents had claimed. But there are still a number of provisions of the Clean Air Act that have never been implemented, and now we have much more scientific and medical evidence to inform our decisionmaking. We know that a drop of mercury can poison an entire lake. We know these things now. We know the harm of mercury and toxic chemicals. We know how much is coming from power plants.

The rule for power plants is long overdue. It's been in development for close to 20 years. If one wants to talk about uncertainty, how about allowing certainty by letting EPA finalize its rules on mercury, on air toxics, and on cross-State air pollution. Then we will protect the health of our people. Then our plants will know exactly what is expected of them.

The fact is municipalities do this for their waste recovery plants and their medical waste incinerators. They are required to do it. And no municipality ever went bankrupt over this regulation. And medical wastes are disposed of today in a safe and reliable manner.

We can do this, we should do this, and we should defeat this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would say to my friend from Virginia that EPA is not always as transparent as they may seem. When they issued the greenhouse gas regulation in January of this year, they did not give the public any information about cost or benefits, and the reason they didn't is they didn't conduct one.

At this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished former chairman and chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a real leader in our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

I would like to start off, Mr. Chairman, by making the point that the TRAIN Act doesn't change any existing environmental law or existing environmental rule. It simply delays proposed regulations that the EPA has promulgated and requires a study of some of those regulations before moving forward with them.

My friends on the Democratic side would have you believe that we're going in and gutting the Clean Air Act. Nothing is further from the truth. I'm

a cosponsor of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1991, and believe it or not I'm a strong supporter of an active EPA enforcing existing rules. I have a sister whose an enforcement attorney at the EPA in Dallas, Texas, and has about a 99 percent conviction rate. So Republicans want a strong EPA. We want strong air and water quality rules, but we also want, in this struggling economy, some common sense to be used before proposing new additional rules.

There is no criteria pollutant under the Clean Air Act that is currently becoming worse. In fact, the air is becoming cleaner, and that can be proven factually by monitoring. Every power plant in the country is monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, as are our chemical plants and all major source emitters. The data is there, Mr. Chairman.

The question that I asked the EPA Administrator today, Lisa Jackson, is: Is it better, Madam Administrator, to keep an existing plant that is in compliance with existing air quality regulations in production, or is it better to close that plant because it can't comply with new, more stringent regulations that are being proposed? That's the question. And that's the reason that Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. WHITFIELD and myself and others have either sponsored or cosponsored this legislation. We want strong air quality regulations. We want those rules enforced, but we don't want an EPA that continues to go stronger and stronger and stronger, regardless of the economic consequences.

Now, Mr. WHITFIELD, tomorrow, is going to offer an amendment that replaces the proposed Cross-State Air Transport Rule with the CAIR regulation that the Bush administration promulgated back in the early 2000s, that he wants a delay of the proposed boiler MACT while we have a little more time to implement that. And he also has, at my suggestion, put into that amendment that we should use real monitored data as opposed to EPA-modeled data. How unique. Let's actually use what's happening in the real world.

This monitoring versus modeling does not mean the EPA can't use models. We understand that you would have to be able to model the environment and the effects, but you can use real data to put in your model, not projected or hypothetical data. Real data.

The Whitfield amendment is an important addition to the TRAIN Act, and I hope that we will support it.

With regards to mercury, mercury has been reduced since the mid-1990s by 90 to 95 percent in the United States.

□ 1850

The gentleman who spoke about mercury just now correctly stated the amount of mercury that's emitted, 96,000 pounds, 48 tons, 96,000 pounds. What he did not say is that that is less than 1 percent of the total mercury emitted in the country. Most mercury

that's emitted is emitted by natural causes; and if you enforce the new proposed mercury regulation, you're going to get an improvement of .0004 percent, four-thousandths of 1 percent.

For an average 500-megawatt coal-fired power plant, they emit about 70 pounds per year of mercury.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We've already reduced mercury emissions by 90 to 95 percent. To get another 90 to 95 percent is so cost prohibitive that you would probably just shut down some of those plants. In my opinion, that's not necessary.

So what the TRAIN Act, in conclusion, is doing, Mr. Chairman, is just saying let's do a time-out. Before we go forward with any new regulations, let's make sure that there really is a true benefit that outweighs the cost.

In my district alone last week, a closure was announced of one plant and one coal mine that are going to cost directly at least 500 jobs. That's not hypothetical. That's not modeled. That's real. And if all these plethora of EPA regulations go forward, you're going to see thousands of jobs eliminated, billions of dollars in cost, and very problematic improvements in health.

Please vote for the TRAIN Act when it comes up for final passage.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the record straight because I think we're getting a lot of false information. We are told that this bill doesn't weaken any existing law. That's not correct. The Cross-State Rule has already been finalized, which means if you are living in an area where pollution's coming from another State, and there's nothing you can do about it, the State that's causing the pollution has to reduce that pollution in order not to affect you. And that's going to be repealed by this legislation that's before us.

We're told all that's going to happen is we're going to delay some of these rules. Well, yes. We're going to delay the rules. And then Mr. WHITFIELD is going to offer an amendment to make sure that EPA can never adopt any of those rules.

And the thing that just galls me is the statement that the benefits from reducing mercury are insignificant. Well, EPA was unable to quantify or monetize all the health and environmental benefits associated with the proposed toxic rule, but EPA believes these unquantified benefits are substantial. We are talking about impaired cognitive development, problems with language, abnormal and social development, potential for fatal and nonfatal heart attacks, association with genetic defects, possible auto-immunity effects in antibodies. This is not insignificant. And I think that it's not accurate to tell us that this bill simply provides some transparency. I think the authors of the bill ought to

provide us a little bit more transparency.

I at this point want to yield 6 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I enjoy listening to the former chairman of the Commerce Committee in his argument on the floor. He gave us part of the story.

I find a certain irony, however. He talked about how he supported the 1990 Clean Air Act. Well, many of the arguments he makes that we're hearing here today could have been directed towards him and his own support in 1990.

But bear in mind what happened in 1990. It didn't impose a bunch of rules and regulations. It put in motion a process so that we would have those studies. From 1990 to 1998, EPA was studying the issue. They came to the conclusion that the study mandated under the 1990 Clean Air Act required that we promulgate rules to regulate this pollution.

From 1998 until 2005, the Clinton administration, and then the Bush administration's EPA, they kind of studied it. They came to the same conclusion. The Bush administration came up with rules that were so flawed they were thrown out by the Courts. It didn't meet the standard that was required by your 1990 Clean Air Act.

So here we are now, in 2011, 21 years later, talking about another study to delay it further, delay further what the gentleman, and I would say a number of Republicans on the Commerce Committee, supported in 1990. But now it's crunch time. We actually have to do something.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying we shouldn't pick winners and losers in the economy. Well, Mr. Chair, I find it ironic that this Dirty Air Act does pick winners and losers. Who are the losers?

I agree with my good friend from California, the ranking member, the losers are hundreds of thousands of people will die, get illness from cancer, asthma, lost school days, millions of lost work days, the lost quality of life that is documented beyond belief. This is real, and these people lose.

Who else loses?

The downwind areas lose because they will not be able to act to be able to deal with the problems that the pollution drifts over their jurisdictions. And as again my friend from Southern California pointed out, that means that local communities that don't have the protection because we can't stop the drift, they're going to have to do all sorts of things that are more expensive and less effective, and it's not their fault.

The losers are going to be the American economy. We will lose the economic benefits of getting the work from unions and contractors from pollution control. Bear in mind, pollution control devices are an export area. We have a net benefit. We make money exporting this abroad.

We lose the net economic benefit of the lost health. We bear the cost of unnecessary damage.

But there's another area of losers. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting, in December 2010, eight major CEOs sent a letter to the editor of *The Wall Street Journal* saying that they didn't oppose—that the EPA agenda would have negative economic consequences. Their companies' experience complying with air quality regulations demonstrates that regulations can yield important economic benefits, including job creation and maintaining reliability.

On March 16, 2011, six leading energy companies joined together to applaud EPA's release of one of their proposed rules.

The losers in the approach that you take are the early adapters, the people who took the law at its word and started cleaning up. They lose by taking the word of Congress that we were serious about reducing pollution, including one of my local utilities, Portland General that's moving ahead to close down a dirty coal plant to meet their responsibilities.

Who wins under the Republican approach?

Well, the winners, under the Republican approach, are those who profit from pollution: the people who are dragging their feet, who bet that we will, yet again, have another study, that we won't follow through. The winners under this are the people who are cynical, who think that they don't have to comply with the Clean Air Act.

I noticed that today, in *China Daily*, dated September 22, the Chinese are talking about their tougher emission standards. They are talking about the fact that there's a pushback from their utilities because there's cost of compliance. But they know that there is a health benefit. They can't continue to pollute. And there's an economic benefit for people who move ahead with the compliance. The Chinese are going to make money by being cleaner, adopting technologies to reduce emissions.

□ 1900

Mr. Chair, I'm embarrassed that we have, after 21 years, a proposal to yet again delay implementation, that they're picking winners and losers, putting people who profit from pollution ahead of people who are responsible. It's just wrong.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon that it is correct that the court invalidated the current Air Transport Rule that we have in effect in America today, but I would also like to read from that decision because one of the reasons they invalidated this law was because EPA was looking at a regional basis rather than within individual States.

The court said: "It is possible that CAIR would achieve air transport goals. EPA's modeling shows that

sources contributing to North Carolina's non-containment areas will reduce their emissions even after opting into CAIR's trading programs."

My point in saying that is this still is a particularly effective Air Transport Rule.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2401, the TRAIN Act, and I want to congratulate my friend from Oklahoma for this good piece of legislation.

For the past 9 months I've been on the floor of the House, and it's been my mission to rein in, or at least to attempt to rein in, some of these out-of-control regulators in this country today who intend on keeping our economy in the ditch by placing barriers in the way of job creation and in keeping jobs.

I'm so glad that this bill is on the floor because this job-killing regulation is center stage at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see the TRAIN Act provisions delay this EPA job-killing and energy-killing rule known as Cross-State Air Pollution for the next 6 months.

Let's point out that we heard comments about transparent analysis. My own State, Texas, was dropped into the final Cross-State Air Pollution Rule in the last minute. Texas was not included in the proposed rule, and our citizens were denied their right under the Administrative Procedures Act to review the impact and comment on the proposed rule. We just got kind of air-dropped into this at the last minute.

Thirty-one members of the Texas delegation have written a letter to the White House, including eight of the Democrats in our delegation, expressing concerns about this rule and how it was forced down the throats of the citizens of Texas. I think that that ought to be some indication that something is wrong here.

Now, Mr. BARTON indicated something that is actually larger than what he stated. In his district, one plant has closed, but two plants have actually closed in Texas as a result of this rule already, and three mines have closed. And we know at least of the 500 jobs that Mr. BARTON has referenced here today, but we haven't gotten the count from the other two.

This is a serious loss of good-paying jobs to Texas. These are the kinds of jobs people seek after.

The step in the right direction is to hold off. And when you say you're doing studies, by the very statements made on this floor, it's about scientific proof. But there are also human beings involved in this, and we should at least do an economic analysis of what this does to our economy, which I think this administration is bound and determined to drag down into the mud. And I think we should know how many jobs we're going to lose. We're trying to build jobs, not lose jobs.

We are, in this country, about growing jobs in America, not losing them. And these regulations are job-killing regulations.

I'm really pleased with the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee on all of their hard work on these issues. This is important to American workers everywhere.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican spinmeisters like to come up with slogans. So they've come up with the slogan "job-killing regulation." Well, let me tell you what we're talking about: children-killing pollution.

And I just think that when we hear the statements that they're not going to weaken or delay any rules that protect public health and the environment, we shouldn't take their word for it.

I have a letter here from the National Association of Clean Air Agencies. They represent the State and local air pollution control people who are on the ground every day working to improve the Nation's air quality. What they say is that if this bill is adopted it "will create regulatory delays that could lead to thousands of premature deaths, remove important regulatory tools upon which States and localities depend, impose additional costs on government as well as small businesses, create regulatory uncertainty, cause job losses, and defund an important and cost-effective air pollution control program."

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend and the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is extraordinary even for the most anti-environmental House of Representatives in American history. The Republican leadership has attempted already to pass over 110 anti-environmental bills, amendments, and riders. But the TRAIN Act would be one of the most destructive for America's environment and our public health.

It appears that the Republican leadership took every anti-environmental bill, rider, amendment, and nighttime fantasy of the Koch brothers and wrapped it into a single legislative package called the TRAIN Act.

This bill would block clean air, public health standards for mercury, dioxin, smog, soot, and other toxic pollutants. We're supposed to believe no, no, no, all we're doing is just delaying and studying. Twenty-one years is a long time to study. And if you have a loved one whose health is at stake, that delay can be life threatening.

By increasing the incidence of emphysema, lung cancer, asthma, and cardiac diseases, this bill will kill 25,000 Americans every year—nearly as many as are killed in highway accidents.

Just one standard this bill would repeal, the Cross-State Air Pollution

Rule, would have significant ramifications for my district and for the National Capital Region from which I come. The wind transport of power plant and other harmful emissions from polluters to the west in our community is one of the reasons the Capital Region is listed as a non-attainment area for air quality. But we have to clean it up.

The preponderance of harmful ground level ozone threatens seniors, asthmatics, and those with respiratory conditions—not to mention the fact that it threatens our eligibility for long-term transportation funding.

Monitoring and responsibly regulating cross-State air pollution here and in other regions would save, not cost, save \$280 billion a year in health care costs. But not if the Republicans pass this bill.

But of course they don't want you to look at the other side of the ledger. There are benefits to be had by implementing the EPA standards rather than delaying them, \$280 billion worth, but they don't want you to know that. They don't want to talk about that.

I was proud to work with a number of my colleagues to lead a group letter signed by 60 Members of this body reaffirming our support for the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. This public health standard is critical for economic and human health in our region. That rule is just one example among many successful public health standards established under the Clean Air Act.

Since its inception in 1970, the Clean Air Act has produced economic benefits that far outweigh the cost of compliance by as much as 8 to 1. The Small Business Majority credits the Clean Air Act with widespread economic benefits, both across urban and rural communities, improving public and worker health, and creating jobs, millions of them.

□ 1910

Each year, the Clean Air Act prevents 22,000 hospital visits which would otherwise be caused by pollution-induced respiratory diseases, 67,000 chronic asthma and bronchitis attacks, and saves over \$110 billion in health care costs. The TRAIN Act would block nearly every major public health standard being implemented by the Clean Air Act.

I heard my colleague and friend, Mr. GRIFFITH from Virginia, talk about a letter he read in a local newspaper in Charles County, Virginia. This couple purportedly couldn't understand why bureaucrats who were sitting on their rear ends somehow come up with these fantastical regulations that are just burdensome and serve no purpose.

Perhaps if that couple had sat with a child in a hospital room, fighting for his or her breath, they'd understand why we need these regulations and why those professionals at EPA are doing their job to protect public health. Perhaps if they had seen a loved one or a

spouse hooked up to tubes, fighting for her life because she's severely asthmatic, they'd understand why we need these standards. Perhaps if they understood a friend had COPD and has to walk around now all the time with oxygen in a mask to function and be mobile, they'd better understand the life-and-death struggle of people who live in areas affected by dirty, polluted air and would better respect why the EPA is protecting our health—even if that couple in Charles County doesn't understand.

I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I ask how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 25 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. HARPER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the TRAIN Act is on the House floor today as part of the Republican regulatory relief agenda to reduce job-killing government regulation on businesses. Americans are tired of Big Government, and a majority believes that government regulation coming out of Washington, D.C., has a costly impact on life essentials, such as food and gasoline. Too many Americans are unemployed, and a recent survey shows that 70 percent of voters believe that increasing regulations on American businesses will result in more jobs moving overseas. That is unacceptable.

No government agency is more to blame for an absurd increase in regulation than the Environmental Protection Agency. We all want clean air. We all want clean water. We're all conservationists and want those things, but the effects of the actions of the EPA are clear—they're killing jobs and job creation.

We've asked our colleagues on the other side of the aisle over and over, Where are the jobs? I submit that a thorough investigation of recent EPA regulations could answer that question.

I encourage a "yes" vote on the TRAIN Act so that Americans will have an even better understanding of the negative impact that the EPA is having on each of our lives.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for yielding.

I rise in support of the TRAIN Act, which will help give small businesses and our Nation's job creators the certainty they need to hire, expand, and

invest. This is an excellent bill which will help create the pro-growth environment our economy needs.

Upcoming EPA gasoline regulations, along with other regulations impacting domestic refiners, have the potential to raise the price at the pump, to reduce domestic gasoline output and increase reliance on imports, and to destroy domestic refining jobs. Fuel price changes create a ripple effect throughout the economy, increasing the price of food, goods, and services that are transported to our communities, increasing the price of driving to work each day.

These broad impacts must be taken into account when we seek to understand the cumulative impact of EPA regulations on the energy prices, jobs, and our global competitiveness. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting the TRAIN Act.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me thank all of us who are assembled here on the floor tonight to talk about the state of our lungs, the state of our health, and to talk about how the deprivation of protection will lead to harming our health. It's a sad day, and I'm just glad we're here to debate this issue so that the American people can see who's for them and who's not.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle call "regulation" we call protecting our lungs. What they call "red tape" we call fighting asthma from mercury. What they call "government interference" we call staying out of the hospital and getting some asthma treatments and being able to eat the fish that we catch in our rivers and streams across this great Nation. What they call "job-killing regulation" we call child-killing pollution.

It's just amazing how different the world would be if we could all just focus on what really matters.

What we really should be doing is arguing about how we can get Americans back to work. That's not what we're doing. What we're doing is trying to say, if they got rid of all the regulations—all the health and safety regulations—and then if they even got rid of all the taxes, then the business community would have enough certainty to actually hire somebody.

But I don't think anybody really believes that.

We've got a nation in this world that has gotten rid of all the regulations and that doesn't really tax anybody. It's called Somalia. I don't think that's a good business environment for much of anybody unless you're a warlord.

The fact is that, instead of focusing on creating jobs, Republicans are bringing up another assault on our public health—in the Clean Air Act. We should have the American Jobs Act here, and we should be debating that. We should be passing bills to create

jobs and improve economic growth. We should not be telling American workers that the only thing between them and a job is a regulation to protect their lungs. They're trying to say, A paycheck or your lungs. You can have a paycheck or you can have asthma, but you can't have a paycheck and be well. That's what they're arguing today, and this is what we have to reject.

Instead of bringing up bills to create jobs, the GOP is bringing up yet another assault on the Clean Air Act, blocking two of the most important lifesaving Clean Air Act rules in decades—the Mercury and Air Toxics rule and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule.

The Mercury and Air Toxics rule will prevent 17,000 premature deaths per year. I couldn't agree more with the gentleman from Virginia, GERRY CONNOLLY, who reminded us that, if you've ever held the hand of a loved one who is suffering through an asthma attack, it would be hard to see how you could callously vote for a bill like this TRAIN Act, which I like to call the Train Wreck Act, because it's just that bad. The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule will prevent 34,000 premature deaths per year.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman, and I'll wrap it up with this:

We can have energy and jobs. The Clean Energy Group, a coalition of energy utilities and power companies, has said that the changes in industry practice that the Mercury and Air Toxics rule would produce are reasonable, can be accomplished, and are not a burden on industry. Not all industry agrees that we need to get rid of every regulation. A study released by the Environmental Defense Fund has estimated that the Mercury and Air Toxics rule and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule would together create nearly 1.5 million jobs over the next 5 years.

So let me just say that it's time for the American people to say we want good health, that we want good jobs, that we want clean air, and that we want healthy lungs—and we don't want the train wreck bill offered by the Republicans.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

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

□ 1920

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I rise today in support of the TRAIN Act.

Despite what my friends and colleagues across the aisle say, we are not out to poison America. My children, my wife, I breathe the air and drink the water in this country.

What we are asking for is to look at regulations with a scientific analysis and not an emotional analysis. Do what every business in this country

does. Do what every family in this country does when they are faced with tough decisions or any decision.

When I go to the grocery store, I have the option of buying ramen noodles or lobster, and I usually settle somewhere in the middle on chicken. Businesses look at the cost and benefit of everything that they do just like families do.

What we are asking through the TRAIN Act is to take a look at what these oppressive regulations cost. We've got great regulations in place now. We've improved the air immensely. Let's see if it's worth going the next step.

We can factor in all of the things that our friends on the other side of the aisle want, but we need to do the study, and we need to have the information so we can make informed decisions.

The money that these excessive regulations cost businesses are passed on to the consumer. American families are asked all the time to make sacrifices to make ends meet.

As these regulations run up energy costs, our families' electric bills and gasoline bills go up, and they have to make decisions about whether they're going to fill their car with gas or what kind of food they're going to buy, if any, to put on their tables.

We have got to keep people working. If these regulations put people out of work, the families that the wage owners support suffer too. They don't have the money to pay their bills. They don't have the money to buy food. They don't have the money to buy medicine. We have got to be as intelligent as we are compassionate.

The intelligent thing to do is to do a cost-benefit analysis of what regulations do. That's what we are asking in the TRAIN Act. Let's use our brains.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the language in this bill does not prevent the EPA from regulating emissions from coal-fired utilities, and it does not prevent the EPA from dealing with cross-State pollution. The EPA must regulate emissions under its current rules.

So let's focus on the facts as presented by the EPA.

Thanks to the Clean Air Interstate Rule, emissions from fossil fuel power plants in the lower 48 States were 44 percent below 2005 levels by 2009.

In the past 40 years, our population has grown 48 percent. Gross domestic product has increased 209 percent and coal-fueled electricity has increased by 184 percent. Yet during that time, emissions from coal-based electricity generation have dropped by 60 percent.

Despite this success, EPA is still pushing for the most expensive rules ever imposed on utilities, every single dime of which isn't paid by the utili-

ties; it's paid by everyday Americans who use electricity and by America's manufacturers.

Just the two rules in this bill, the ones that the TRAIN Act seeks to delay, would increase the nationwide average price of electricity by 11.5 percent, and it's even worse in this Nation's manufacturing States. Look at this map. The upper Midwest could see their electricity rise by 17 percent; Michigan by 20 percent, one of the States that's really hurting; Kentucky and Tennessee, by more than 23 percent. These are where our manufacturing jobs reside.

Raising energy costs would remove one of the few remaining advantages that U.S. manufacturing has over low-cost foreign competitors, that is, access to affordable, reliable energy.

My own industry people tell me that the one advantage they have over foreign countries when it comes to competing head to head is the availability of affordable, reliable energy. And on the environmental side, President Obama's former environmental czar, Carol Browner, herself, said that the rule would provide "no health benefits associated with addressing non-mercury emissions."

The rhetoric, Mr. Chairman, used to attack this bill has reached a fever pitch, but it is not backed by the facts.

I urge my colleagues to support the TRAIN Act.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky yielding to me on this very important legislation.

At a time when 25 million Americans are unemployed or underemployed, the last thing Washington needs to be doing is making it more difficult to grow the economy. But that seems to be the operating question of this administration. The question is this: They ask, how can we make it more challenging for America's job creators to hire?

America's energy sector is under direct assault. Energy companies looking to meet the rapidly growing energy needs of our Nation are either being forced to put on hold their efforts or are self-imposing barricades on future construction or expansion as a result of new or anticipated regulatory requirements.

It has been reported recently that 351 stalled energy projects cost the Nation \$1.1 trillion in GDP and 1.9 million jobs, yes, jobs. On this list is the Sunflower Electric Power Plant in Holcomb, Kansas. Sunflower Electric is a rural co-op that with a needed expansion can provide many new jobs in western Kansas.

Most importantly, this expansion will allow Kansas to have the energy it needs in order to prevent brownouts, which are a very real possibility and a threat to our part of the country. Not

only do families, schools, and hospitals depend on this energy production but. So does our agriculture sector, which is a key and vital component of rural Kansas.

Sunflower faces considerable, unnecessary, and excessive regulatory scrutiny, not only for its existing operations but for the planned expansion in Holcomb as well. Whether it is the cross-State pollution rule, the MACT rule or many others, each one of these has a major impact. But the bigger problem—and that is what the TRAIN Act wants to demonstrate—is that these rules will be devastating and expensive to America's energy industry and all Americans.

The President came before this House a few weeks ago and talked about the need for America to improve its infrastructure. Power plants in America are the very type of infrastructure that our country needs, particularly when energy consumption is growing rapidly in our Nation. These private companies, private companies, are willing to add to the country's infrastructure and create jobs, all without the help of the Federal Government. In fact, all they need is for Washington to take a step back.

A Kansas business leader summed up this administration's guilty-until-innocent approach to regulation. He said, "We have a regulatory environment that assumes businesses are crooks, and government must catch them at it. This only raises the costs on business and makes it more difficult to operate."

I think his analysis says it all.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I inquire how much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

□ 1930

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, let me just mention, I congratulate my counterpart from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) in bringing this forward and giving us a chance to work through this process. We both come from the beautiful State of Oklahoma. And I invite anyone to be able to come to Oklahoma and drink our water and breathe our air and see the beautiful land, but also see a very successful State in dealing with energy.

We've done hydraulic fracking in our State since 1949. And while it may be new to other States, it's not new to Oklahoma. Over 100,000 times in Oklahoma we've done hydraulic fracking. Yet I would invite you again, come drink our water, come breathe our air, come see our beautiful land.

Our State leadership has done a tremendous job in dealing with environmental quality issues, and they have

done great in relationships with companies, whether that be power companies, utility companies, whether that be actual producers, whether it be service companies, through the process. It's a great model in much of the United States, if you get a chance to come and see what's going on there.

But what we're currently experiencing is this whole sense that if the Federal Government doesn't come down on Oklahoma and every other State around the United States, surely children will die. Surely people will be thrown out of work because they have these wonderful compliance jobs required by the EPA and other areas.

It's a frustration for me to be able to hear someone stand up in this Chamber and say, If those Republicans get what they want, 25,000 people will die next year because those mean Republicans are going to come and shut everyone down.

People should know, I have children that live in the State. In fact, I have a child that has asthma. If you want to talk about a dad who loves his children and who wants to see a great future for them, that's me as well. It's not as if Republicans are suddenly wanting dirty air and dirty water; we just want basic common sense in our regulations.

If every company, whether they be the energy producer or whether they be some utility, is constantly looking over their shoulder worried every day that some new restriction is going to come down on them and change their plan, they can't function. They can't go forward. They can't find investors for that business. What they're doing is very capital intensive, and if the rules change constantly and the regulations are constantly shifting, no one can really do investment, and the cost of all of our electricity goes up. The cost of every product that we buy goes up. The cost of every bit of our food goes up because we've added regulations, many of which make no sense. And they spend years and years trying to fight them in the courts just to not be shut down from doing what is best and right for the community.

I understand there are bad actors. I do. And those bad actors should suffer consequences. But to be able to say that every energy producer and every utility out there is suspect and they'll never do the right thing unless we stand over them with thousands of regulators, I think overlooks the reality of a great-hearted group of Americans scattered around the country who are doing their best to do the right thing.

Now, some would also say that these regulations aren't all that large, they're not all that expensive. They're just a bunch of small regulations. It reminds me of a friend of mine several years ago that was hiking through central Africa. And he and a guide were hiking through and he made the mistake in this particular area of swatting a bee that was one of those killer bees that we hear so much about. And as soon as that bee stung him and he

swatted it, thousands of bees came down on him and began to sting him. Those bees kill, not from a single sting, but from thousands. That's what our utility companies are facing right now. It's not one little regulation; it's hundreds of them coming at them all at once, and they're trying to figure out through lawyers and through adding additional staff and compliance people, how do we manage all of these regulations coming.

This TRAIN Act does a simple thing. It begins to pull all of these regulations together and look at them in totality. I understand that you say that's just one little piece, and it's one little piece there, but let's look at them all together and be able to find out the consequences of them. Rather than have these things coming from everywhere, let's simplify the structure on it.

I urge this Chamber's support of getting some common sense back into our regulatory scheme.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to correct some of the statements that have been made. The gentleman from Oklahoma talked about the clean air in his area. That's fine. They have attained the standards for protecting public health. But there are a lot of other areas where they don't have that attainment of health-based standards.

Market forces alone will not correct problems that hurt our public health and the environment. Why should any business spend money to install pollution control devices if they don't think their competitors are going to do the same thing? So government must establish some standards so that everybody knows what the rules are going to be and the investments will be made.

Approximately two-thirds of the coal-burning power plants in this country have the up-to-date controls in those power plants. What we're talking about for the most part are those third we were told were going to be retired. But they're not being retired. They're still being used, and they're still polluting. And those power plants ought to come up to compliance with the reductions in their emissions.

One of the other speakers on the other side of the aisle said we don't have a real economic analysis of all of these regulations. That's not true. There are thousands of pages of economic analysis before these regulations have been promoted.

Another person on the other side said a lot of these rules are so onerous that they should be blocked because we're going to be threatening the reliability of the Nation's electric grid by causing these old, inefficient power plants to put modern pollution controls on them. Well, that's not the testimony that we received on September 14, 2011, in the Energy and Commerce Committee where Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Chairman Jon Wellinghoff took a different position, as did FERC

Commissioner John Norris, and former DOE Assistant Secretary for Policy Susan Tierney. A stack of independent analyses confirmed that these protections that will require controls on these power plants will not threaten the reliability of our grid.

And over and over again we've heard unless we adopt this TRAIN Act, we are going to lose jobs. Well, the TRAIN Act blocks and indefinitely delays two of the most important clean air regulations of the past few decades: the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, which are, again, directed at those power plants that emit toxic air pollutants, including mercury and carcinogens; and then the other rule is the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule to reduce power plant emissions that cause pollution problems in downwind States.

I don't believe they're telling us the facts when they say we're going to lose jobs. The truth of the matter is, according to the Economic Policy Institute, they reported in June that the Air Toxics rule would have a positive net impact on overall employment, creating up to 158,000 jobs between now and 2015.

The Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts released a report showing that the utility investments driven by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and the Air Toxics rule would create nearly 1.5 million jobs by 2015.

Moving toward a cleaner, more efficient power sector will create capital investments such as installing pollution controls and constructing new capacity. These new investments create a wide array of skilled, high-paying jobs.

And I must say to my Republican friends, if we want to create jobs, let's pass the President's jobs bill. I'd like the Republicans not to block every effort by this administration to create new jobs in this country.

There are numerous groups that are on record in opposition to the TRAIN Act. Obviously, the public health groups are opposing the bill: the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Thoracic Society, and the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America. The American Public Health Association called this ill-conceived legislation that would prevent EPA from protecting the public's health from dangerous and deadly air pollution. The National Association of Clean Air Agencies, the ones that are doing the job of protecting our environment, groups that represent millions of Americans, particularly all of the environmental groups, oppose this.

Scientists have told us—and I know a lot of Republicans deny science—but scientists, I think, are to be respected. And they say sacrificing tens of thousands of Americans' lives will not create more jobs. Poisoning the air our children and our families breathe will not stimulate the economy.

Three hundred sportsmen organizations representing our Nation's hunt-

ers, anglers, and the businesses that depend on our wildlife and natural resources support EPA efforts to cut mercury pollution and strongly oppose any efforts to weaken the Clean Air Act.

The Evangelical Environmental Network opposes these efforts to block the Mercury and Air Toxics rule because they point out that in the developing brains of fetuses and children, this will cause learning disabilities and neurological problems, and is not something that people who claim to be pro-life ought to support.

□ 1940

The Obama administration opposes this TRAIN Act. They threaten to veto this legislation if it reaches the President's desk. Americans don't support weakening the Clean Air Act or blocking EPA's efforts to reduce dangerous air pollution from power plants.

I think, my colleagues, that this TRAIN Act and some of the amendments that are going to be added to it are reason enough to oppose this legislation, and I urge opposition to it.

I am going to reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, is not ready to close on the legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I was prepared to close, but we do have one other speaker, and then I will close. He just came in, and we were not totally aware.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a chairman of one of our subcommittees.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I do apologize to my friend from California for coming late and kind of disrupting what was planned to be a closing, but this is an important debate, and my colleague from California and I have crossed sabers many times on these issues. I don't question his commitment to the environment and the regs and rules and the like.

As he knows, I'm from southern Illinois. I'm from an area that was devastated in the jobs issue and during the 1992 Clean Air Act, and I'm from an area of the country that still is not being all it can be based upon the excessive rules and regulations that come out of Washington, D.C.

The TRAIN Act is really a first step to help us ask a simple question: Shouldn't we, as an interagency process, shouldn't we at least ask the basic question of what effect is this going to have on jobs and what effect will it have on our competitiveness worldwide?

It is really a basic debate. It's a good one to have. I applaud the chairman for bringing this to the floor. We need an

up-or-down vote because, as much as we want clean air, we would like jobs. They're not exclusionary. We can do both. We have the cleanest environment that anyone has seen in decades in this country, and it is attributed to the work that past Congresses have done. But the difference is this, that in today's environment—well, let's go back.

Three decades ago, when you wanted to clean up 50 percent of the emissions, you could make the capital investments and you could do it. The debate now is: How clean is clean? What is the cost benefit analysis and what is the effect on jobs if we get to a limit that you don't find naturally?

What the TRAIN Act basically does is it says, before we promulgate more rules and more regulations, we ought to at least admit the fact that it may affect our competitiveness in our economic position. We ought to accept the premise that if you continue to put more rules and regulations on electric generation, that electricity costs are going to go up. What does that do to the manufacturing sector? I think that's what this bill is just asking. If we find out these answers and we figure out that the economic costs outweigh the environmental benefit, well maybe we better slow down. If we decide the environmental benefits are so great that we're willing to accept the cost, then we ought to move forward. But for us not to have this debate is not doing our job and it is not doing our duty.

I am really pleased that we've brought this bill to the floor. We've had numerous hearings. We've gone through the legislative process. I appreciate Speaker BOEHNER and the openness because we've had hearings. We had a subcommittee mark. We've had a full committee mark. We've had this debate on amendments to this bill, and now we're ready to have this debate on the floor.

The last hearing we had in Chairman WHITFIELD's committee was on the reliability issue, and I took to task the chairman of the FERC who, in their own analysis, said that if we continue to move on this regulatory regime, 80 gigawatts of power is going to go offline. Now, EPA did the analysis, and they said eight. So you've got a tenfold difference. Well, maybe they're both wrong. Maybe it's 40 gigawatts.

My friends, 40 gigawatts is a lot of power and will affect the reliability of the electricity grid in this country. We rely on that reliability for a lot of things. We rely upon it in the manufacturing sector and the manufacturing facilities, but we also rely upon the reliability in the safety of our citizens who are in the hospitals and in long-term care who need power to those facilities just for their livelihood.

So if our aggressive environmental movement takes away 80 gigawatts of power, will that affect our electricity reliability? I think it will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. The EPA did an economic analysis looking at the cost and benefits. And on the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, they said that the costs would be less than a billion, but the benefits would be up to \$280 billion per year, 150 to 350 times its cost.

I want the chairman of the subcommittee to answer a question when he closes. I believe the Republicans have misrepresented this bill during the debate, but false information was put on their Web site tonight. They claimed hundreds of groups support the TRAIN Act, and immediately two groups came forward, and maybe others will as well, saying that they would never support the TRAIN Act—Clean Water Action Committee and the Clean Air Watch.

I'd like to know if the information that is on the Web site is being checked for accuracy, because I know that a lot of things that have been said in this debate from the other side of the aisle have not been accurate.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the gentleman for the debate today. I was not aware that we had sent out a letter of supporters of this legislation, and evidently in that letter there was a letter in opposition that should not have been in there. If that created any hardship for anyone or problems, we certainly do apologize for that.

We should remind ourselves that by every public health measure, from infant mortality to life expectancy, we are healthier today and are exposed to fewer hazards than ever before. Our present day air is much cleaner now than years ago thanks to EPA, and our air quality is among the best in the world. And we recognize the importance of EPA. However, when EPA becomes so aggressive, as this EPA has become, and in a very short period of time they've come forward with 14 regulations—and we know that when you look at cost-benefit analyses, different entities come up with different figures on the cost and the benefits.

We, for example, have come up with an analysis on the Utility MACT and the air transport rule alone saying that the annualized cost of that will be \$17 billion, that industry will have to spend that kind of money to get new equipment, that the total cost between 2011 and 2030 would be \$184 billion. But one of the figures that really scares you in this is that they say there will be a net loss of 1.4 million jobs. Now, we know that some jobs will be created in trying to build this equipment that these regulations are going to require, but most of the analyses that we've seen indicate that there is going to be more of a job loss.

□ 1950

All the TRAIN Act is doing is saying let's have an independent government

agency, including EPA, do an analysis of cost/benefit of all of these rules. We would also like them to look at what impact does it have on America's ability to be competitive in the global marketplace. We'd also like for them to look at what will be the job loss, net job loss. We would also like for them to look on what impact it's going to have on electricity prices as well as the reliability of electricity.

And on 12 of those regulations, we do not stop them in any way; but on two of them, the ones that are most costly—Utility MACT, and what I refer to as the "air transport rule"—we do, in this legislation, delay the effective date of those, the implementation of those until 6 months after the report is due that this legislation requires.

Now, in my view, that's not being unreasonable. Some people think it is because it is the first time that Congress has ever come to the floor to question some of the EPA regulations, and I really think that that's our responsibility. They issue the regulations; but if they reach a point where we think they're being unreasonable, then we have an obligation to come and let's examine these, let's look at them before we move totally forward with it.

Now, Lisa Jackson, when she has come before us and testified, she has always made the comment that "I'm creating jobs with these new regulations." And as I said earlier, she does create new jobs, but the net effect in there is a loss of jobs. Now, some of these rules may be great in areas like California and New York and the Northeast and elsewhere; but in the areas of the country where coal—and, by the way, coal still provides 50 percent of all the electricity in America. Our electricity demand is going to increase significantly in the next 30 years, so we're going to have to rely on coal. But a lot of these regulations are going to put coal miners out of business because they're going to close some of these coal mines. It's going to put some coal-fired utilities out of business because they're going to close these utility plants because the cost is not going to be worth what they have to do to meet these air quality regulations.

Now, on the air quality regulations, the question becomes, if you're 98 percent pure already, is it worth this much money to go 2 percent more? So that's the question we come down to, and that's why we ask for this analysis; and I would urge everyone to support this TRAIN Act legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2141

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-215) on the resolution (H. Res. 412) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of such report. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good

friend from Rochester, New York, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

All time that I will be yielding and that my friend from Rochester will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through what James Madison, the author of the Constitution, has described as an ugly, messy, difficult process. That's the legislative process. And while many of us have been frustrated, it does work at the end of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it has to work. It has to work because our fellow Americans are suffering at this moment.

I have just been talking to staff members of the House Appropriations Committee, and we have to get the resources to those people who are suffering ASAP. As of this morning, there was a grand total of \$212 million in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's fund to deal with these disasters that have taken place. Last spring, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Ms. Napolitano, testified that we needed additional resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's go back to last spring and realize that was before we had hurricanes. It was before we had floods. It was before we had tornadoes that hit the Midwest. Think of those poor people in Joplin, Missouri, all those homes and lives that were lost. And it was before we had this earthquake that, as we all know, damaged the Washington Monument right down the street from where we are.

Mr. Speaker, it's very important that we get those resources there, with only \$212 million as of this morning. With expenditures somewhere in the neighborhood of 30-plus million dollars each day, it means as early as Monday of next week we could end up with nothing, nothing for those people who are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we don't want the government to shut down. We want to make sure that the people who are truly in need are able to have the resources necessary. But at the same time, we recognize that we have a \$14.5 trillion national debt. We have massive deficits that are before us, and we need to do everything that we can to do what people across this country are saying needs to be done—we need to create jobs. We need to generate an increase in our gross domestic product growth, and the measure that is going

to be before us when we report out this rule will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the measure that we will consider is identical to the measure that we considered in the House yesterday, the measure that had been reported out, basically the same package that we had last week. But a bipartisan request that was made by the Senate majority leader, Mr. REID, and the Senate minority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, was that we have this provision considered as a Senate amendment so that the Senate would be able to move as quickly as possible to ensure that our fellow Americans have the resources that are necessary. And so that's why we have ended up with the same measure that we had yesterday.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you and I have discussed in the meeting that we were just in, there has been a change. There is a very minor change. It is one single paragraph. So of the continuing resolution that we had, which is \$1.043 trillion, exactly what we had yesterday, no change, in full compliance with the 3-day layover requirement that exists in the House rules—and I will remind my colleagues the measure that's before us was put online on Monday, 4 days ago, so, again, in full compliance with time to spare to meet the 3-day layover, with one amendment. The amendment reads as follows:

“At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

“Section 142. Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Title 17—Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program’ pursuant to title IV of division A of Public Law 111-5, \$100,000,000 is rescinded.”

That is the only change that has been made. Let me tell you why that change was made, Mr. Speaker, and I don't often read *The Washington Post* on the House floor, but today's *Washington Post* has an article that explains what it is that led us to call for using the \$100 million that I just mentioned as an offset.

I recognize, as one of my colleagues in the Rules Committee stated earlier, we know that this company known as Solyndra, which Democrats and Republicans alike recognize has been an abject failure for this energy program, is one that will not get resources because they have gone bankrupt.

But let me just tell you what led to us focusing on this \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we never again have another boondoggle like Solyndra. This is, again, today's *Washington Post*, in an article entitled, “Solyndra's Ex-Employees Tell of High Spending, Factory Woes.” It reads as follows:

“Former employees of Solyndra, the shuttered solar company that exhausted half a billion dollars of taxpayer money, said they saw question-

able spending by management almost as soon as a Federal agency approved a \$535 million government-backed loan for the start-up.

“A new factory built with public money boasted a gleaming conference room with glass walls that, with the flip of a switch, turned a smoky gray to conceal the room's occupants. Hastily purchased state-of-the-art equipment ended up being sold for pennies on the dollar, still in its plastic wrap, employees said.

□ 2150

“As the \$344 million factory went up just down the road from the company's leased plant in Fremont, California, workers watched as pallets of unsold solar panels stacked up in storage. Many wondered: Was the factory needed?”

“‘After we got the loan guarantee, they were just spending money left and right,’ said former Solyndra engineer Lindsey Eastburn. ‘Because we were doing well, nobody cared. Because of that infusion of money, it made people sloppy.’”

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that our fellow Americans are suffering across this country because of the tremendous very, very sad disasters that we have faced over the last weeks and months, and it is very important for us to recognize that every taxpayer dollar is precious, especially in these times when there are people losing jobs, losing their homes, and losing their businesses.

This is a very sad and tragic example of the kind of waste that is there, and that is why the one very small but important modification to the measure that is before us will be to take \$100 million and use that additionally as an offset to ensure that the hard-earned dollars of the American people are not wasted in the way that we have seen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my speech today will be very much like my speech yesterday, but then so is the bill. Yesterday the House on both sides of the aisle defeated the majority's first attempt to pass a continuing resolution. And here we are 24 hours later with the very same bill. Let me repeat, the bill we're debating today is barely changed from the one that was defeated yesterday. The bill still contains unacceptable cuts to an essential manufacturing jobs program to pay for equally essential disaster relief.

Homes have been destroyed. Roads have collapsed, and local economies have been disrupted by a seemingly endless stream of hurricanes, tornadoes, tropical storms, and extreme weather that has crisscrossed our land. Our moral compass makes it very clear. We know what we need to do. We

must come to the aid of our fellow Americans who need our help. The problems they are facing are monumental, and quite simply, no one can recover from such natural disasters on their own. They need our help.

Yet the majority's efforts to hold disaster relief hostage to unacceptable cuts is as unwise today as it was 24 hours ago.

As I said yesterday, when it comes to spending billions of dollars on two wars that are bankrupting us, the majority's concern for spending is nowhere to be found. Since 2004, American taxpayers have spent over \$3.4 billion as emergency spending on infrastructure in Afghanistan, and even more in Iraq. Not a single one of these \$3.4 billion was offset, but were paid for by the same taxpayers that are being denied taxpayer money now. While we send billions of dollars to Iraq, the Iraqi government has begun building. They announced today a high-speed rail system to connect Basra to Baghdad. That's the same week that the majority in this House took all of the high-speed rail away from the United States. And so we will be paying for 280 miles in Iraq, but we can't pay for it from Buffalo to Albany.

When it comes to Americans in need, when it comes to helping women, children, and families whose homes have been washed away, the majority has decided they just can't help unless they get to take the money from a program that has created 39,000 jobs and is poised to create 60,000 more.

The bill was wrong yesterday, and it's wrong today.

Let me just give you some information from me, I believe, The New York Times. The headline says, "Republicans Sought Clean-Energy Money for Home States." Senator MCCONNELL asked for \$235 million for an electric vehicle plant in Kentucky; Representative LAMAR SMITH asked for stimulus money for a solar plant in Texas; Congressman FRED UPTON wanted five clean energy projects in Michigan; Representative CLIFF STEARNS asked for a lithium ion battery manufacturing plant in Florida. These requests for funding came from the very same program that has been discussed being cut these last 2 days.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand by your beliefs. If you thought the bill was wrong yesterday, there is no reason to think the bill is better today; virtually nothing has changed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this flawed bill.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 2011]

REPUBLICANS SOUGHT CLEAN-ENERGY MONEY FOR HOME STATES

(By Eric Lipton)

WASHINGTON.—On the Senate floor and the television airwaves, Senator Mitch McConnell has lambasted the Obama administration over what he has described as its failed efforts to stimulate new jobs through clean-energy projects backed with billions of dollars in federal loans or other assistance.

But Mr. McConnell, of Kentucky, is one of several prominent Republicans who have worked to steer federal money to clean-energy projects in their home states, Energy Department documents show.

Mr. McConnell made two personal appeals in 2009, asking Energy Secretary Steven Chu to approve as much as \$235 million in federal loans for a plant to build electric vehicles in Franklin, Ky.

"I hope you will realize the importance of such job creation to Kentucky," Mr. McConnell said in a July 2009 memo supporting an application from Zap Motor Manufacturing.

Federal lobbying disclosure records show that Mr. McConnell's support for the project came after Zap Motor hired a Kentucky-based lobbyist, Robert Babbage, who has been a frequent contributor to Mr. McConnell's campaigns and boasts on his own Internet site about his close ties to Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Babbage declined to comment on the project. Gary Dodd, chief executive of Zap Motor, said the intervention by Mr. McConnell came after the company asked him to push the Energy Department to approve the loan.

Mr. McConnell's office, in a statement, defended his actions, saying, "There was no effort to push the administration to short-circuit its due diligence simply to plan a ribbon-cutting."

Mr. McConnell's high-level advocacy took place despite early struggles for the project, including the financial collapse in 2008 of its first Kentucky business partner, Integrity Manufacturing. Mr. McConnell made no mention of these stumbles as he pushed for federal money, simply saying Zap Motor might create as many as 4,000 jobs in his state.

Recently, he has joined with other Republicans in criticizing a March 2009 decision by the Obama administration to provide a \$535 million government-backed loan to a California solar-panel manufacturer, Solyndra, which recently filed for bankruptcy and is now the subject of inquiries by the F.B.I. and Congress.

"The White House fast-tracked a half-billion-dollar loan to a politically connected energy firm," Mr. McConnell said Thursday in remarks on the Senate floor. "This place was supposed to be the poster child of how the original stimulus would create jobs."

Another Republican, Representative Lamar Smith of Texas, recently asked Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. to appoint an outside investigator to determine how the Department of Energy distributes clean-energy money. But in 2009, Mr. Smith wrote to Mr. Chu asking him to approve loan guarantees from stimulus money for a Texas project proposed by Tessera Solar, documents show.

Representative Fred Upton, Republican of Michigan and another critic of the Energy Department program, signed letters along with other members of the Michigan delegation in 2009 and 2010, pushing at least five clean-energy projects in his state, including a \$207 million loan request from EcoMotors International. And Representative Cliff Stearns, Republican of Florida, praised the opening last year of a lithium-ion battery manufacturing plant in his state, which relied upon an Energy Department grant.

Mr. Smith, along with the others, defended their actions, saying lawmakers can be critical of the Energy Department programs while still seeking money.

"I wanted to support Texas companies in their applications for grants," Mr. Smith said in a statement. "It is the responsibility of the Obama administration to carry out the necessary financial reviews of these proposals."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply say when Ms. PELOSI was Speaker of the House of Representatives, my friend from Rochester chaired the Rules Committee. The disaster relief provided in the response to Hurricane Katrina was partially offset. This is not in any way unprecedented. It's the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House is badly broken. This Republican leadership is out of touch. This process is a disgrace. This is not the way the people's business is supposed to work. We are now debating a continuing resolution that has the same objectionable provisions that were rejected yesterday on a bipartisan basis. Plus it has additional provisions that cut jobs. It's even worse.

So here's the deal: what's objectionable to people like me is my Republican friends continue to insist on cutting programs that will result in the elimination of American jobs. Their view is simple. If you want to help victims of tornadoes and hurricanes, then we have to pay for it, and we pay for it, in their view, by cutting jobs—not tax cuts for millionaires; not subsidies for Big Oil; not cutting incentives that encourage sending American jobs overseas. What they're advocating is cutting American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership, in my opinion, doesn't have a clue. They are obsessed with cutting government at all costs, including programs that help sustain American jobs, including programs that help prevent the elimination of American jobs. And here's the deal. The issue is jobs. They may not want to hear it, but the central issue before our country is jobs. I don't care where you go in this country, what people want to talk about is jobs and the creation of jobs as a way to secure our economy. What we should be talking about on the House floor tonight is jobs. What we should be talking about on the House floor tomorrow is jobs. What we should be talking about every day until the American people are back to work is jobs.

Instead, under this Republican leadership, we're debating trivial issues passionately and important ones not at all. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to, at a minimum, allow Democrats to bring up the President's jobs bill so we can put people back to work.

The best way to reduce the debt in this country is to put people back to work. Even a slight drop in the unemployment rate in this country would result in an incredible reduction in our debt.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this continuing resolution because it is

about eliminating jobs. It's not about creating more jobs; it's about eliminating jobs. Reject this continuing resolution because it plays politics with the lives of American citizens who have been victimized by natural disasters.

I urge the Republican leadership to, at least in this one instance, try to be bipartisan. We talk about an open House. We talk about bipartisanship. Here's an opportunity for us to be bipartisan. Let's work together on behalf of the American people. Let's get this bill right, and let's focus on jobs. That's what the American people want. This bill falls far short of that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell my friend from Worcester that clearly jobs is the priority that we are focused on. I appreciate very much and would like to associate myself with his remarks when he talked about the need for us to focus on job creation and economic growth. And I know I'm speaking for everyone, everyone on our side of the aisle, when we say we want to work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we can get our economy growing and so that the American people who are hurting will be able to have job opportunities.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2200

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources. This combines a speech he would have made yesterday with one he's going to do this evening.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Write today's date down, September 22, 2011. The Republicans are now in open warfare against clean energy. Yesterday was an opening salvo, but today is the declaration of war. They've already gutted clean energy research and development budgets by 40 percent for next year. Their budget for the next 3 years promises to cut those investments by 90 percent. They've zeroed out loan guarantee programs for all renewable energy in their budget while leaving intact \$25 billion for the nuclear industry. They're prepared to shut down the government rather than rescind one penny of the oil and gas industry's \$41 billion in tax subsidies. But clean energy sector gets the hammer.

Yesterday, in a gratuitous assist to Big Oil, Republicans tried to kill the Clean Car Factory Fund in order to pay for natural disaster relief. This is the program that is helping American companies manufacture superefficient vehicles that reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign oil from OPEC. But, apparently, that bill wasn't radical enough for the Tea Party base. So tonight, they come back and they're launching their full-frontal assault on clean energy. Yesterday, it was just

clean cars. Today, it's solar energy, wind energy and all renewables. Tonight, they take out the full assault attack.

But a word of warning. Up to a dozen projects are prepared to receive the green light in the next week. swooping in and destroying this program now will destroy these projects and destroy the thousands of jobs that will come with them. So before you vote for this bill, check and see if your State is one of the 38 that has received support under this program. Check and see if your State is one of the 12 that could have a new project announced next week. Make sure that the 66,000 people that have jobs today as a result of this program are not from your State. By the way, those 66,000 jobs created through this program are far more than any jobs created through legislation passed out in the first 9 months that the Republicans have controlled the United States House of Representatives.

So our planet is warming and extreme weather is increasing; 100-year floods and droughts are now striking every few years. Hurricanes have caused floods, massive power outages, and deaths. Texas has been on fire after having the hottest summer ever recorded. The President has issued disaster relief declarations in 48 States so far this year. Eighty-three major disasters declared in 2011, the all-time record; 3 more months to go this year. Wake up. Wake up. You can't kill these programs. This is the solution you are killing.

Republicans say, fine, we'll provide emergency relief for those who have been afflicted by nature's wrath in an ever-warming planet, but we won't do it unless we can cut the funds for the programs that promise to be the solution to the problem. That's what they're proposing here tonight.

Does the majority ask if we can save money by cutting the hundreds of billions of dollars we are planning on spending, the Republicans are planning on spending on new nuclear weapons being constructed over the next 10 years when we don't need any more nuclear weapons? No. Can we cut the tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies we pay to Big Oil and King Coal? Of course not. But wind, solar, clean cars, all-electric vehicles and plug-in hybrids, oh, yeah, let's cut that program tonight to fund disaster relief for people in this country suffering from weather, from floods, from hurricanes, and from tornadoes caused by an ever-changing climate.

This bill is an embarrassment. This is not worthy of this Congress. Vote "no" on this latest Republican assault plan to kill the clean energy industry in this country on behalf of the Big Oil and Big Coal industries.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to say to my friend that there have been 1,100 jobs lost at Solyndra. We want to make sure that there is never

again, never again another Solyndra. That's the reason that we have focused on the \$100 million as an offset in this measure, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's also very important to note this morning when I woke up I heard the news that General Motors is now in the midst of an international partnership in the People's Republic of China to deal with the development of electric vehicles. These are the kinds of things that the private marketplace is pursuing. I live in Los Angeles, California, where we have very serious air quality problems, and we just got the news today that Washington, D.C. is number six in the Nation when it comes to air quality problems. We want to make sure that we have energy-efficient automobiles. We are determined to do that. We need to make sure, we need to make sure that those companies that are out there pursuing these kinds of alternatives that, frankly, in most all cases are free, are free of government grants, are able to succeed with that; and that's why we have proceeded with that.

If my friend would like me to yield, I'm happy to yield to him.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman. I'm glad you brought out the General Motors deal because the General Motors deal is only possible because of the grants and the loans that have been given for the batteries and for the new technologies under these programs that are now making it possible for General Motors to reinvent.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend that obviously we have seen the General Motors deal proceed. The fact of the matter is it's not solely because of that that we are seeing this kind of partnership. But, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the private sector proceed with a policy that I believe very strongly in, and that policy is being pro-environment and is, in fact, pro-business.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield myself 1 minute to respond to the General Motors-China issue.

Earlier this week, The New York Times had a wonderful article in the business section that the Chinese were subsidizing electric cars to the tune of \$19,000 which all of us know is against every trade law the world has ever seen. But they were going to sell the Volt, and GM announced—they actually told them that in order to sell the Volt at all in China they had to give over all of their technology and all the information they had on how to build that car. I thought they weren't going to do it, but I also read yesterday that now they've got a brand-new Chinese partner, and they're giving them all the technology. I've got some legislation to bring into that, Mr. Speaker. I think it's outrageous that that's what's happening to American manufacturers.

I would like to now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan who

knows a thing about General Motors, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, here we go again. You tried to cut jobs last night. You lost. Now, you're trying it again. When Americans need jobs, the Republicans are pushing an anti-jobs bill. Here's what the NAM said about this program that you want to curtail: "The ATVM program is an example of what government-industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

So you listen to nobody except your empty rhetoric and, I think, dangerous action. If that wasn't enough, here's what the Chamber of Commerce said: "The ATVM program promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component of America's energy security."

□ 2210

So yesterday, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we sent him a letter citing his reference to the ATVM loan program as a "government subsidy for failing industries." GM failing? Chrysler failing? Ford failing? How misguided.

Well, now you're on your rampage to kill jobs and you've proposed to cut another program, section 1705, the loan program to help investments in new energy technology. This is a dangerous precedent. It's also, let's be frank, a dangerous smokescreen so some Republicans can change their votes. That's what this is all about.

Well, you don't want to listen to Warren Buffett on taxes, and now you're thumbing your vote at Bill Gates. They issued a report yesterday—Bill Gates and a number of other technology leaders—and I quote from the report about energy programs like what you're trying to cut:

"If the U.S. fails to invent new technologies and create new markets and new jobs that will drive the transformation and revitalization of the \$5 trillion global energy industry, we will have lost an opportunity to lead in what is arguably the largest and most pervasive technology sector in the world. However, if the U.S. successfully innovates in clean energy, our country stands to reap enormous benefits."

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. It goes on:

"Unfortunately, the country has yet to embark on a clean energy innovation program commensurate with the scale of national priorities that are at stake. In fact"—and I interpolate here this is what you're doing—"rather than improve the country's energy innova-

tion program and invest in strategic national interests, the current political environment is creating strong pressure to pull back from such efforts."

That's exactly what you're doing today. This bill is dangerous mindlessness.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply remind my colleagues why it is that we're here.

We're faced with the prospect of a government shutdown. There was a grand total as of this morning of \$212 million in the fund to deal with our fellow Americans who are suffering because of disasters that we've gone through over the past several weeks and months, and we want to make sure that the appropriations process, which has been dumped on us, is able to be addressed in a bipartisan way. I want Democrats and Republicans alike to come together to address this.

The \$100 million additional offset, the only minor modification that has been made, is to ensure that we don't have—and I know Democrats and Republicans alike agree on this—we don't want to have another Solyndra. And that's what we believe we can do.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Tomorrow will be yet another Friday without a paycheck for too many Americans. For many Americans, this may be the week that their unemployment benefits finally run out and they have no income left whatsoever. For many Americans, this might be the last weekend they spend in their home because the eviction notice or the foreclosure process comes due next week. There has been a natural disaster this summer in America, but there has been an economic disaster in America for a very long time.

Fifteen days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and in good faith laid out a plan to put Americans back to work. In those 15 days, this majority has had no hearings, no discussions, and no votes on the President's plan to put the country back to work. Until today, it was accurate to say they had done nothing about the job situation in America. Today, they've done something. They put forward a bill that destroys a program that has created 39,000 jobs in the private sector.

My friend from California talked about the new deal that GM may strike to build the new generation of cars in China. With all due respect, that's the point. The purpose of this program is to make sure that the next generation of cars is built by Americans and sold to Chinese, not built by Chinese and

sold to Americans. So if we let this bill pass, we are waving the white flag of surrender on the next generation of vehicles.

Now, they say, well, we have to do this because we have to provide disaster relief. I think there is unanimity in this Chamber that the victims of floods and hurricanes and other crises deserve help, but the artificial excuse that's being used here is, well, we have to pay for the help.

I have a suggestion. We're going to spend in the next 10 days in Iraq and Afghanistan what it would cost to deal with this disaster relief. How about that? Instead of crushing American jobs here at home, why don't we do the intelligent thing and say to the Iraqis and the Afghans, it's time they ran their own country with their own money. How about that for an offset? We should never have to choose between employing our neighbors and ignoring our needs.

The right vote here is "no." Let's bring back to the floor tomorrow a plan that both sides can support that keeps Americans working, puts Americans back to work, and solves this disaster problem. Vote "no," and then let's fix the problem.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply say that job creation and economic growth is what we are all about. The deal about which my friend just referred to is one which is part of the global marketplace. The goal of having U.S. manufacturers, U.S. workers manufacturing automobiles for sale in China and vice versa is our priority.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding and I appreciate the time because, as we talk about the President's jobs bill, I was here, too, when the President came to present his ideas, and it kind of excited me. Because, as I looked at where the President began on some of these jobs issues and I looked at what has been proposed in this House already on these jobs issues, I realized exactly how much progress we were able to make.

I think about the President's proposal to eliminate oil company subsidies, a proposal that I support. In fact, I have a bill that not just eliminates oil company subsidies, but all industrial subsidies so that we can let the free market drive that train and create those jobs anew.

I think about the President's proposal to curtail the payroll tax and I think, we already have a proposal that not only curtails the payroll tax to the small degree the President recommends, but actually, since it's the largest tax that 80 percent of American taxpayers pay, eliminate it entirely.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'm limited to only 2 minutes. If my friend from New York would like to yield me time, I would be happy to yield that back.

But I just want to say, as my friend from the Ways and Means Committee knows, not only do we have that proposal introduced here—it's H.R. 25, the Fair Tax. We've had hearings on it in the Ways and Means Committee. So I say to my friend from New Jersey, we are moving forward on those agendas.

But let me just talk about why we're here tonight.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. If I could get some time from my friend from New York, I would love to yield to agree with you. I wanted to tell you how much I believe we're headed on the same track.

But let me talk about this continuing resolution because that's really why we're here, despite the fact that folks bring up where we are in the President's jobs bill. This is about getting disaster relief to families that need it. And we could have gotten it done yesterday—and should have gotten it done yesterday. And even though I'm new at this process, I actually thought we had an agreement to get it done yesterday. I thought we had an agreement because it was the right thing to do to get it done yesterday. Now, only folks who are more privy than I know why that agreement came unglued and why it was we didn't get it done, but we're back here tonight and we have that opportunity. Please, please, let's get it done for those folks who need it. The time for games has long since passed.

□ 2220

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Before I yield to my friend from New Jersey, let me respond to my friend from Georgia. Don't forget that 48 on your side voted against it. I don't know what agreement you had with them.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I did want to ask my friend from Georgia a question, Mr. Speaker, if I might. He says he's on the right track.

Will the gentleman agree that we should have an up/down vote on the President's jobs plan on this floor?

Mr. WOODALL. I actually don't like those kind of long, complicated bills, I would say to my friend. But should we vote on his ideas, one idea at a time—I say that regularly. Had we voted on the President's health care bill one idea at a time, America would have loved 80 percent of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, is that a yes or a no?

Mr. WOODALL. That's a let's vote on it one idea at a time, not just his ideas, but all of our ideas.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the gentleman vote for the President's tax cuts for small businesses that create jobs if they hire someone?

Mr. WOODALL. The tax proposal I'm familiar with is his \$1.5 trillion tax increase. Is there a different—

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the President's plan was a small busi-

ness that creates jobs will get a tax cut.

Will you vote for that?

Mr. WOODALL. If he wants to reduce the highest corporate tax rate in the world, I am a huge supporter of that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, is that a yes or a no on that idea?

Mr. WOODALL. I will vote for any reduction in corporate rates that the President proposes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, does the gentleman favor the provision that says we should put teachers who have been laid off back in the classroom?

Mr. WOODALL. I absolutely do, and with State and local funds we're doing that today. I hope we'll continue to do that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, would the gentleman agree, though, we should use some Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. I do not believe the Federal Government should be involved in education.

Mr. ANDREWS. I disagree.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close on our side. If my friend is prepared to close, then we can close the debate here and move to a vote on the rule, and then move directly to consideration of the appropriations bill, so that the American people will be closer to getting resources they desperately need.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am expecting another speaker who is not yet on the floor.

My speaker has arrived, Mr. CROWLEY of New York, and I will yield him 3 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I'm not opposed to keeping our government up and running. In fact, I want desperately to support a bill as simple as keeping the Federal Government up and running.

What I'm imposed to is, I believe, ugly, out-right partisan politics, especially at a time when Americans want to work constructively together to address the serious problems that we're all facing. But bipartisanship is not at work here tonight, and it has not been here for some time.

Since President Obama announced the American Jobs Act, my colleagues on the other side have held zero hearings, not a single hearing on that plan.

Since Solyndra announced it was going out of business, the majority has held three hearings, and there are more scheduled to come. Let's be clear. We should get all the answers, every answer about Solyndra's failings. But I'm sorry. That is not a comprehensive agenda that will produce one single job.

Time is ticking because, while we stand here tonight quibbling about how to pay for the day-to-day functions of government, and how best to assist American communities hurting after hurricanes, flooding, droughts, and

wildfires, Europe and China are working overtime to outcompete us on every front.

President Obama and the Democratic Party have a plan for keeping the U.S. competitive on the global stage. We have a plan for keeping American businesses, workers, and industries stronger and better than our foreign competitors.

It's Democrats who got engaged and saved GM and Chrysler. It's Democrats who created the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, a program that has created almost 40,000 auto manufacturing jobs in less than 2 years. And it's Democrats who have led the way on green energy.

By contrast, the GOP agenda can be summed up in one word: "roadblock." Not road building, roadblock.

Republicans aren't focused on producing jobs. They oppose trying to put Detroit back on its feet. They are opposed to bringing President Obama's bills to the floor. And in the very bill we are debating right now, they are making cuts to the very manufacturing program I just cited as a job creator.

My colleagues, there are Americans across the country who are hurting. They've lost jobs, been foreclosed upon, and have endured extreme natural disasters of all kinds. They cannot accept a Congress that isn't willing to put them first. They cannot accept a Congress that insists upon offsets for aid to rebuild America, but not for aid to rebuild schools, hospitals, and roads in Iraq and Afghanistan. They cannot accept a Congress that holds more hearings on the failure of one company, but not one hearing on a job plan for America. I'm sorry, but this is not acceptable.

Vote "no" on this bill and reject the GOP's roadblock agenda.

Mr. DREIER. I am prepared to close the debate on our side.

I reserve the balance of my time for that purpose.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, for granting me this time to say, at first, I really didn't believe it when someone suggested to me that the Republican Party would really like to defeat President Obama by raising the unemployment rate. I thought, that's too cynical to really believe.

But in this particular proposal tonight, what we see is a proposal by the Republican Party to take money from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program to help America compete in the auto industry with state-managed economies like China's and Japan's, and take it away from recovering auto firms and unemployed auto workers to give to disaster victims around this country.

It's a no-win game. We're hurting the American people. We take from one sector that is suffering for another sector that is suffering? In the greatest

automotive manufacturing country in the world, we don't want to put more people back to work because we want to defeat the President next year?

I'm starting to believe those that suggested this cynical ploy. Why should we hurt the automotive industry that is just beginning to hire back and starting to lift this economy in the industrial Midwest and through hiring at parts suppliers coast to coast?

Vote "no" on this cynical ploy to set disaster victims against unemployed auto workers in the automotive industry of this country, which has a right to compete. If you want to offset \$1.5 billion in costs of disaster assistance, take it from the bonuses Wall Street titans keep pocketing. For them, it's only pocket change.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, our Democrat leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I commend her for her enormous leadership, patience, and great intellect that she brings to bear on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate, it's really almost hard to explain to someone why we're coming back tonight with the same old, same old warmed-over stew that was rejected yesterday by the Congress of the United States. But since then we've had some support expressed for the initiative that is contained in this bill and against the notion that our Republican colleagues have that it's a good idea to use this as a pay-for.

I take particular pride in this provision that the Republicans are trying to zero out in this bill, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program.

You will recall, Mr. DREIER, that it was part of a bill that was passed when President Bush was President. It was the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. It was a bill that passed the Congress with strong bipartisan support, including your support, Mr. DREIER. In fact, 95 Republicans voted for the bill. It was an even split in the Republican Caucus, 95 for, 96 against. But you recall voting for that.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. No, I'm sorry, because you have a half an hour and I don't.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I've been mentioned three times, and since the gentlewoman has mentioned me—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California controls the time.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman has all the time. For some reason the Republicans are not showing their faces on the floor on this amendment. He has plenty of time on this bill, plenty of time to speak. If he didn't, I'd be more than happy to yield to him, but since he has so much time on his own, he can use that.

In any event, here's the thing. We have an initiative that is bipartisan.

We have an initiative that has passed the House in overwhelming numbers, 314-100; 314-100 it passed the House after coming back from the Senate.

Yesterday, there was an attempt made to use the funds allocated to the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program to offset the disaster assistance. I myself believe it is a matter of principle that we should just do with disaster assistance what we always have done, have no doubt in anyone's mind that when a disaster, a natural disaster strikes, the Federal Government will be there, FEMA will be funded, and that we don't have to look around for a place to say, let's prioritize. No, the disaster assistance is our priority.

□ 2230

But on top of that, they use as a pay-for, again, zeroing out the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing. I don't want you to take my words for the merit of this initiative. I want to quote for the record the letter from the United States of America Chamber of Commerce and the letter from the National Association of Manufacturers.

First from the Chamber of Commerce:

"As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes. Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that is critical to the Nation's recovery."

Then they go on to say that this is funded by the Department of Education, and that it's not the fault of industry if these funds have not been used.

In the NAM letter, National Association of Manufacturers, they say similarly:

"We express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program, authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush."

It was a very proud day for us when President Bush signed this bill. It made tremendous advances in energy efficiency and conservation. It was a great accomplishment of the Bush administration and a Democratic Congress working together, but the bill passed in strong bipartisan fashion.

"The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sec-

tor jobs and put our Nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

I will submit the rest of the letters for the RECORD so Members can read further for themselves in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and for all who view the work of Congress, they can see the importance of these initiatives, first by the strong bipartisan support that they received in a Democratically controlled Congress but signed by a Republican President, President Bush, a very major accomplishment, I think he believes.

The second point, though, is that, again, American people are looking for ways for us to create jobs. The Republicans have been in power in this Congress in this House of Representatives for over 250 days. They have not passed one bill into law which is a job creator; and today, they come back to the floor a second day in a row with a job destroyer. The repetition of it is almost frivolous when you think that what we could be talking about here is a clean CR, a clean continuing resolution that will meet our needs to November 18.

I thank Chairman DICKS for his leadership on this important issue, Mr. LEVIN, certainly Mr. DINGELL, who was a champion of this initiative from day one and a leader in the fight to preserve it here.

It could just have been so simple. Let's just keep government open until November 18 with a clean continuing resolution instead of coming to the floor and for the first time.

Now my colleagues will say, Well, we've had other emergencies that were funded. I'm not talking about emergencies. There are many emergencies. I'm talking about disasters. I'm talking about natural disasters when people's homes are swept away. This isn't political. This is very, very personal, if you've lost your home, your belongings, your livelihood, your business, your sense of community, the character of the area in which you live, as many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done. When you see the nature of the natural disasters, whether it's out-of-control forest fires in Texas, what happened in Joplin, Missouri, which is almost biblical in its proportion, and what happened on the east coast with the earthquake followed by hurricane followed by tornado followed by floods and all that goes with it.

Do you think people think that we have any relevance to their lives if we're talking about something like this when all they are saying is, Help. It's as if a building is on fire and you're going to figure out who is going to pay for the water instead of just running to the rescue.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this and urge my Republican colleagues to please pull this back, bring a clean CR to the floor. Let's get serious about the people's business.

CHAMBER OF CONGRESS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2011.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, strongly supports disaster relief funding to assist victims of natural disasters. The Chamber is also a vocal proponent of fiscal responsibility and recognizes that Congress must make difficult but necessary choices among competing priorities.

As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) loan program. First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes. Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that is critical to the nation's recovery. Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry; numerous loan applicants have been in the queue for years, waiting for the Administration to complete its due diligence.

Again, while the Chamber understands the importance of reducing America's unacceptable debt and believes that all programs must be on the table, the Chamber urges you to bear in mind the facts about the ATVM loan program, which promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component of America's energy security.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
September 22, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: The NAM is the largest trade association in the United States, representing over 11,000 small, medium and large manufacturers in all 50 states. We are the leading voice for the manufacturing economy, which provides millions of high-wage jobs in the U.S. Two-thirds of our members are small businesses, which serve as the engine for job growth. Our mission is to enhance the competitiveness of manufacturers and improve American living standards by shaping a legislative and regulatory environment conducive to U.S. economic growth.

The NAM is writing to express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program, authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs and put our nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.

Introducing any new model motor vehicle is a capital intensive process. Automobile manufacturers and suppliers must make large investments at the front end before a

vehicle enters production. The ATVM program assists this process by providing low cost capital for retooling U.S. facilities. These loans, which will be repaid with interest, allow automakers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S. and provide greater job security for the workers they employ. Furthermore, it is worth noting that many suppliers to the automobile manufacturers are small and medium manufacturers. These smaller manufacturers have the potential to create thousands of jobs but are typically some of the first businesses impacted by a struggling economy. By maintaining the ATVM program the government will also be supporting the maintenance and growth of these smaller manufacturers.

During this time of economic recovery, we urge you to preserve this successful program that is helping preserve auto sector jobs and promote energy security.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. YOST.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I'll be happy to yield to my distinguished California colleague at any moment as I make a couple of remarks here as she walks off the floor.

I asked her to yield, Mr. Speaker, because she three times referenced me as it relates to the vehicle program, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturers program. Let me just explain what we're faced with today, Mr. Speaker.

What we're faced with is the challenge of ensuring that we get the resources necessary to the American people who are suffering because of these disasters. Now, when my California colleague was Speaker of the House, we had disasters that took place like Hurricane Katrina. Much of that was offset. And so to act as if this is unprecedented is not a correct characterization of what has happened, because we have seen offsets for disasters in the past on numerous occasions over the last decade in excess of \$59 billion in offsets that provided for supplemental appropriations that have been out there.

As it relates to the Advanced Technology Vehicle program, I was going to say to my California colleague who is no longer on the floor, and I'd like to yield to her if she would like to come back to respond to this, there is a total of \$4 billion that is there. What we're doing is utilizing \$1.5 billion. So as people say that this program is being completely eliminated, that is not a correct characterization of what has happened.

Let me tell you what it is we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

We're doing everything that we can to find every dollar that we possibly can to ensure that our fellow Americans who are suffering due to these disasters are able to have the resources that are necessary. Of the \$1.5 billion which is utilized in the offset, it's been sitting in the coffers for 3 years. So to act as if we somehow are going to see some great loss of jobs is again a mischaracterization of what is happening.

We're establishing priorities. We have a priority, that being dealing with our fellow Americans in Joplin, Missouri, who suffered from that horrible tornado that hit that area. That's my home State of Missouri. I know how devastating. In listening to our colleague, Mr. LONG, it's very clear to see in his eyes the kind of effort that he's put in to deal with the rebuilding there. That is a priority.

Dealing with the photographs that we saw from Mr. WELCH's district who voted for this bill yesterday and I suspect will vote for it again this evening to ensure that those who suffered from flooding in Vermont have that. And as I said earlier in the day, our new colleague, TOM MARINO from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, who just in the past several days was trudging through the mud as he reported to my colleagues in our meeting downstairs talking to the parents of children who were literally sitting on the hoods of their automobiles because their homes had been devastated. And the question asked by that parent to Congressman MARINO was, What is it you are going to do? And he said that he was going to come to Washington and do everything that he possibly can, everything that he would be able to do to ensure that they have the resources they need.

Now, to argue that this is pitting a fund that has been sitting dormant for 3 years and is not in the pipeline versus utilization of those resources for the American people who are suffering is a very inappropriate thing to do.

So that was the discussion that I was looking forward to having with my California colleague as she talked about my support of the Advanced Technology Vehicle program.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I'm always happy to yield to my good friend from Detroit.

□ 2240

Mr. LEVIN. Look, no one is saying the total program would be obliterated.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just said no one is saying that. I'm sure that my friend was not here through the entire debate.

Mr. LEVIN. I was.

Mr. DREIER. I don't know that my friend was listening through the entire debate.

Mr. LEVIN. I was.

Mr. DREIER. May I finish, Mr. Speaker?

What I want to say is that we were told that we on our side of the aisle are declaring war—declaring war—by the statement made by our friends from Massachusetts, and from that, one would have to infer that we were trying to obliterate a program.

When we, Mr. Speaker, have 3 years of those dollars sitting dormant, not being expended and not in the pipeline, we believe that we can utilize those dollars for the American people who

are truly in need. We need to move ahead with that as expeditiously as possible, and I think we should try to do that right now and get to the appropriations bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentlelady from New York yield me 30 seconds?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm sorry, Mr. LEVIN. I don't have any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time is there on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman from California yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 1 minute, and I will yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. No one has said that the program will be eliminated. What we have said is what the Manufacturers Association has said. It believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We've had this read to us three times.

Mr. LEVIN. You don't want to hear the facts.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I've heard it three times read on the House floor. We heard the debate earlier today. It was read by our colleagues, Mr. Speaker. I've heard this three times on the House floor.

What I want to say is that we've had, for 3 years, the dollars that we're utilizing for the offset sitting dormant.

Mr. LEVIN. It is not true.

Mr. DREIER. It is true, and it is not in the pipeline to be expended, Mr. Speaker. So, for that reason, I believe the people of Joplin, Missouri, can better utilize dollars that have been sitting for 3 years for absolutely no purpose whatsoever.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question at the end of the debate, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that disaster victims get the help that they need. My amendment will allow Representative DINGELL to offer a motion to strike the unacceptable House language and to substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Here we are again.

Yesterday, the House rebuked the Republicans because they came forward with almost as bad a bill as this. They were going to destroy, as they are tonight, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. It's one of the most successful programs we've had. It has made 40,000 jobs for Ameri-

cans. At a time when Americans are losing their homes, losing their jobs, running out of unemployment compensation, they want to hear us say what we're doing about jobs, what we're doing about opportunity, what we're doing about making the economy grow.

So the Republicans, when they got their heads handed to them yesterday, went back to caucus and made the bill a little bit worse so that they could appeal to their right-wing extremes. The result is that you've got a bill here that has been brought to us that nobody has had an opportunity to see and a bill on which we haven't got any idea exactly what it does.

We hear our good friend from California tell us how the private system of government is working. He says it's working in China because the Chinese have forced GM to work with them to manufacture cars over there so that they can sell them over here. We say that we ought to be manufacturing those cars over here with American workers to sell over there in China and in other countries that are playing the same game with us.

This is an enormously successful program. They're submitting their successes of yesterday by trying now to cut other programs which do this.

They talk about Solyndra. Solyndra went broke for a very simple reason. I sat in on the hearings when I don't think many of the other Members on this side did. I heard that the reason they went under was the trade practices of the Chinese. That's why. They're underselling them in an intolerable way in spite of the fact that we've tried to bring that technology over here and to make it work for the American people in order to provide jobs for the American people.

My Republican colleagues are making a war between the American workers and American industry on the one side and those who have need of relief from the disasters. That's not good. It should not be. It is quite sufficient that we help both. There is no need to have an offset for a disaster, and time after time we have not done it. But not so the Republicans. They are out to kill Department of Energy loan programs. These are programs that create jobs.

Take a look in your district, if they'll give you a copy of this bill, and ask yourself and ask them and ask of the legislation: What are they cutting that is in your district or your State that's going to make jobs and opportunity for your people? You're going to find, when this legislation passes—God forbid it will do so—that you have cut the opportunities and the well-being of your American people who desperately look to us to make the economy go again. You are burning here tonight the seed corn of the American people. You are taking and striking a major blow against the economy and the well-being of this Nation. I say, Shame.

Reject the rule.

Reject the previous question.

Reject the proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to simply say to my colleagues that we're here for a very important reason. The reason is that we want to make sure that we don't face a government shutdown. We want to make sure that we do everything we possibly can so that the people in this country who have suffered from disasters over the past several weeks and months are able to have the resources that they need to do that, and we want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do it in a fiscally responsible way so that we can do what every American and every Democrat and Republican in this House says needs to be done so that we can get our economy growing and put into place pro-growth, job creation proposals. I believe that we can do that. I think we can do it responsibly.

I will say that this is the identical package that we had last night, with one modification; and that one modification is to ensure, with all due respect to my friend, the distinguished dean of this House, that we don't have another Solyndra. Regardless of what some have said was the cause of their demise, when we have employees of that company coming forward and making the case that they were spending money left and right, that they were using it on some of the most outrageous things imaginable, and that the employees could not understand why they built a factory when they had all of these resources in reserve, this cannot be allowed. It's not a responsible expenditure of U.S. taxpayer dollars, Mr. Speaker, and that's the reason we believe this \$100 million can be used for the people who are truly in need.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 412 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after expiration of debate on the motion to concur specified in the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend printed in section 3 of this resolution. That motion may be offered only by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, shall be

debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against that motion are waived.

SEC. 3. The motion to amend referred to in section 2 is as follows:

“(1) Strike sections 125 and 126 of the House amendment (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

“(2) At the end of the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

“SEC. ____ . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby enacted into law the provisions of division B of the amendment adopted by the Senate on September 15, 2011, to House Joint Resolution 66 (112th Congress), relating to emergency supplemental disaster relief appropriations.”.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled

“Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 177, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 725]

YEAS—235

Adams	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Aderholt	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hayworth
Alexander	Denham	Heck
Altmire	Dent	Hensarling
Amash	DesJarlais	Herger
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Austria	Dold	Huelskamp
Bachus	Dreier	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Duffy	Hultgren
Bartlett	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Barton (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Bass (NH)	Ellmers	Issa
Benishek	Emerson	Jenkins
Berg	Farenthold	Johnson (IL)
Biggart	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Bilbray	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Flake	Jones
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Jordan
Black	Fleming	Kelly
Blackburn	Flores	King (IA)
Bonner	Forbes	King (NY)
Bono Mack	Fortenberry	Kingston
Boustany	Foxx	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Brooks	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Broun (GA)	Gallely	Lamborn
Buchanan	Gardner	Lance
Bucshon	Garrett	Landry
Buerkle	Gerlach	Lankford
Burgess	Gibbs	Latham
Burton (IN)	Gibson	LaTourette
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Canseco	Gosar	LoBiondo
Cantor	Gowdy	Long
Capito	Granger	Lucas
Carter	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Chabot	Griffin (AR)	Lungren, Daniel
Chaffetz	Griffith (VA)	E.
Coble	Grimm	Mack
Coffman (CO)	Guthrie	Manzullo
Cole	Hall	Marchant
Conaway	Hanna	Marino
Cravaack	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Crawford	Harris	McCaul

McClintock	Quayle	Smith (NE)
McCotter	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McHenry	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
McKeon	Renacci	Southerland
McKinley	Ribble	Stearns
McMorris	Rigell	Stivers
Rodgers	Rivera	Stutzman
Meehan	Roby	Sullivan
Mica	Roe (TN)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Mulvaney	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Murphy (PA)	Rokita	Turner (NY)
Myrick	Rooney	Turner (OH)
Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Noem	Roskam	Walberg
Nugent	Ross (FL)	Walden
Nunes	Royce	Walsh (IL)
Nunnelee	Runyan	Webster
Olson	Ryan (WI)	West
Palazzo	Scalise	Westmoreland
Paulsen	Schilling	Whitfield
Pearce	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Schweikert	Wittman
Petri	Scott (SC)	Wolf
Pitts	Scott, Austin	Womack
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Poe (TX)	Sessions	Yoder
Pompeo	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Posey	Shuster	Young (FL)
Price (GA)	Simpson	Young (IN)

NAYS—177

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Baca	Green, Gene	Olver
Baldwin	Grijalva	Owens
Barrow	Gutierrez	Pallone
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Pascrell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Berman	Heinrich	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters
Boren	Hinchey	Peterson
Boswell	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Polis
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Quigley
Capps	Holt	Rahall
Capuano	Honda	Reyes
Cardoza	Hoyer	Richardson
Carnahan	Inslee	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Ross (AR)
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Chandler	Jackson Lee	Royal-Ballard
Chu	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Ciulline	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Keating	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kind	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kissell	Schakowsky
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Costello	Levin	Scott, David
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Critz	Lipinski	Sewell
Crowley	Loeback	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Cummings	Lowey	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Sutton
DeFazio	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Matsui	Tierney
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Dingell	McCollum	Towns
Doggett	McDermott	Tsongas
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Van Hollen
Doyle	McIntyre	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Visclosky
Ellison	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Engel	Michaud	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Filner	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Fudge	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann	Calvert	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Giffords
Butterfield	Deutch	Gohmert

Guinta Rangel Speier
Langevin Reichert Stark
Luján Schock Waxman
Paul Shuler Welch

□ 2312

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 176, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 726]

YEAS—238

Adams	Fleming	Lucas
Aderholt	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Akin	Forbes	Lummis
Alexander	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel
Altmire	Fox	E.
Amash	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Amodel	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Austria	Gallegly	Marchant
Bachus	Gardner	Marino
Barletta	Garrett	McCarthy (CA)
Bartlett	Gerlach	McCauley
Barton (TX)	Gibbs	McClintock
Bass (NH)	Gibson	McCotter
Benishek	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Berg	Gohmert	McKeon
Biggert	Goodlatte	McKinley
Bilirakis	Gosar	McMorris
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Rodgers
Black	Granger	Meehan
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Mica
Bonner	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Bono Mack	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Grimm	Mulvaney
Brooks	Guinta	Murphy (PA)
Broun (GA)	Guithrie	Myrick
Buchanan	Hall	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hanna	Noem
Buerkle	Harper	Nugent
Burgess	Harris	Nunes
Burton (IN)	Hartzler	Nunnelee
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Camp	Hayworth	Palazzo
Campbell	Heck	Paulsen
Canseco	Hensarling	Pearce
Cantor	Herger	Pence
Capito	Herrera Beutler	Petri
Carter	Huelskamp	Pitts
Cassidy	Huizenga (MI)	Platts
Chabot	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hunter	Pompeo
Coble	Hurt	Posey
Coffman (CO)	Issa	Price (GA)
Cole	Jenkins	Quayle
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Reed
Cravaack	Johnson (OH)	Rehberg
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Crenshaw	Jones	Ribble
Culberson	Jordan	Rigell
Davis (KY)	Kelly	Rivera
Denham	King (IA)	Roby
Dent	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Dold	Klaine	Rogers (MI)
Dreier	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Duffy	Lamborn	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rooney
Duncan (TN)	Landry	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellmers	Lankford	Roskam
Emerson	Latham	Ross (FL)
Farenthold	LaTourette	Royce
Fincher	Latta	Ryunyan
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Flake	LoBiondo	Scalise
Fleischmann	Long	Schilling

Schmidt Stearns Walsh (LL)
Schock Stivers Webster
Schweikert Stutzman West
Scott (SC) Sullivan Westmoreland
Scott, Austin Terry Whitfield
Sensenbrenner Thompson (PA) Wilson (SC)
Sessions Thornberry Wittman
Shimkus Tiberi Wolf
Shuster Tipton Womack
Simpson Turner (NY) Woodall
Smith (NE) Turner (OH) Yoder
Smith (NJ) Upton Young (AK)
Smith (TX) Walberg Young (FL)
Southernland Walden Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Baca	Green, Gene	Owens
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pallone
Barrow	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters
Blumenauer	Himes	Peterson
Boren	Hinchee	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hochul	Price (NC)
Bralley (IA)	Holden	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rahall
Capps	Honda	Reyes
Capuano	Hoyer	Richardson
Cardoza	Inslee	Richmond
Carmahan	Israel	Ross (AR)
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Chandler	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Keating	T.
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kind	Sarbantes
Clyburn	Kissell	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kucinich	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Costello	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Critz	Lipinski	Sherman
Crowley	Loeback	Sires
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Markey	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matheson	Tierney
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dingell	McCollum	Tsongas
Doggett	McDermott	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Velázquez
Doyle	McIntyre	Visclosky
Edwards	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Meeks	Wasserman
Engel	Michaud	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Finer	Moran	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Giffords	Shuler
Bilbray	Hirono	Speier
Bishop (GA)	Luján	Stark
Butterfield	Olver	Waxman
Carson (IN)	Paul	Welch
Deutch	Rangel	
Garamendi	Reichert	

□ 2319

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 726, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2608.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration”, approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking “July 31, 2011” each place it appears and inserting “July 31, 2012”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) *GENERAL PROVISIONS.*—

(1) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) *RULE.*—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) *APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.*—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled “An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration”, approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) *DEFICIT REDUCTION.*—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) *POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.*—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(A) The Administration” and inserting “The Administration”; and

(2) by striking “research and development” and all that follows and inserting “research and development.”.

(c) **SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.**—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) **DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) **CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.**—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) **PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.**—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) **PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.**—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) **NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) **CORPORATION.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) **LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.**—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) **ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.**—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) **SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.**—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.**—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.”.

(2) **TITLE 10.**—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation”.

(3) **TITLE 38.**—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “any of the” and all that follows and inserting “any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).”.

(4) **VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.**—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking “In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop” and inserting “Develop”.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as “Emerging Leaders” in the document of the Small Business Administration titled “FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual Performance Report” (or any predecessor or successor document).

MOTION TO CONCUR

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 with an amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, that were conducted in fiscal year 2011, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2011 (division A of Public Law 112–10).

(2) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (division B of Public Law 112–10).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 1.503 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2011 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2011 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this Act; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 18, 2011.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this Act may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2012 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2011 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount incorporated by reference in

this Act that was previously designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress. Section 101(b) of this Act shall not apply to any amount so designated.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts for “Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and Expenses”.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this Act, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2012 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts made available by this Act for “Department of Defense—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” may be used by the Secretary of Defense for operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That the authority made by this section shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act: Provided further, That section 9014 of division A of Public Law 112–10 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding section 101, funds made available in title IX of division A of Public Law 112–10 for “Overseas Contingency Operations” shall be available at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate permitted by H.R. 2219 (112th Congress) as passed by the House of Representatives on July 8, 2011.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by section 127(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 119. The authority provided by section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2412), as extended by section 1204(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4623), shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$29,130,000.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2434 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Act of 2011 (D.C. Act 19–92), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the necessary expenses of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, to carry out its functions under title XV of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), at a rate for operations of \$28,350,000.

SEC. 123. (a) Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

(b) Notwithstanding section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)), the Small Business Technology Transfer Program shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)), the pilot program under section 9(y) of such Act shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 124. Section 8909a(d)(3)(A)(v) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2011” and inserting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 129 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2009 (division A of Public Law 110–329), \$500,000,000 is rescinded, \$774,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief”, and \$226,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with “Corps of Engineers—Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies”: Provided, That the amounts made available by this section for the Corps of Engineers—Civil shall be for emergency expenses for repair of damage caused by the storm and flood events occurring in 2011: Provided further, That the amounts transferred by this section shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each amount transferred by this section is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 126. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief” at a rate for operations of \$2,650,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a full accounting of disaster relief funding requirements for such account for fiscal year 2012 not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and for fiscal year 2013 in conjunction with the submission of the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2013.

(b) The accounting described in subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall include estimates of the following amounts:

(1) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that has been (or will be) carried over to such fiscal year from prior fiscal years.

(2) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that will be carried over from such fiscal year to the subsequent fiscal year.

(3) The amount of the rolling average of non-catastrophic disasters, and the specific data used to calculate such rolling average, for such fiscal year.

(4) The amount that will be obligated each month for catastrophic events, delineated by event and State, and the total remaining funding that will be required after such fiscal year for each such catastrophic event for each State.

(5) The amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered each month of such fiscal year.

(6) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for emergencies, as defined in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)).

(7) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for major disasters, as defined in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

(8) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for fire management assistance grants, as defined in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187).

SEC. 127. Any funds made available pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to sustain essential security activities, such as: staffing levels of operational personnel; immigration enforcement and removal functions, including sustaining not less than necessary detention bed capacity; and United States Secret Service protective activities, including protective activities necessary to secure National Special Security Events. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 130. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “October 4, 2011”.

SEC. 131. Sections 1309(a) and 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a) and 4026) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 132. Section 330 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (42 U.S.C. 1701 note), concerning Service First authorities, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 133. Notwithstanding section 101, section 1807 of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting “\$374,743,000” for “\$363,843,000” and “\$10,900,000” for “\$3,000,000”.

SEC. 134. The second proviso of section 1801(a)(3) of Public Law 112–10 is amended by striking “appropriation under this subparagraph” and inserting “appropriations made available by this Act”.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$14,510,000.

SEC. 136. Sections 399AA(e), 399BB(g), and 399CC(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i(e), 280i–1(g), 280i–2(f)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 137. Notwithstanding section 101, section 2005 of division B of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting “\$0” for each dollar amount.

SEC. 138. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011” in section 7 of such Act of 1945.

SEC. 139. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 140. Commitments to guarantee loans incurred under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715e–3 and 1735c), shall not exceed a rate for operations of \$25,000,000,000: Provided, That total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, may be apportioned through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act, at \$80,000,000 multiplied by the number of days covered in this Act.

SEC. 141. (a) RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BUREAU FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in

section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the *Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003*.

(2) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.*—This section shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the *Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003*.

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

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—This section shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

(d) *APPLICABILITY.*—This section shall not be subject to any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 142. Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available for “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Title 17—Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program” pursuant to title IV of division A of Public Law 111–5, \$100,000,000 is rescinded.

This Act may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring to the floor the continuing appropriations resolution to keep the Federal Government operating until November 18, 2011. Before you is a slightly amended version of the bill, which is necessary after last night’s vote. I hope that my colleagues recognize the urgency of this situation and will join me in taking the responsible step and support this CR.

This bill must pass if we’re going to keep our word to the American people. We need to get help to Americans who need it most, those who have lost their homes and their businesses to the unforgiving natural disasters that have beset us.

FEMA is rapidly burning through its emergency funding and its ability to help those people recover from the tornados, hurricanes, earthquakes, wildfires and other disasters.

Right now, at this minute, FEMA has \$200 million left in the coffer. They’re spending at the rate of \$30 million a day for disaster relief. And at this rate, of course, they will be out of money over the weekend.

This infusion of funding—\$1 billion in emergency fiscal year 2011 disaster funding and \$2.65 billion for fiscal 2012—is critical. I can’t stress that enough. And it will go far to relieve the burdens of those who are in need tonight.

This version of the bill creates an additional offset to the fiscal year 2011

emergency funding. In addition to the \$1.5 billion offset from the vehicle loan program, we are rescinding \$100 million from the Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program, a section of the failed Stimulus Act that funded the now-bankrupt company Solyndra.

The CR also continues government operations at a rate of \$1.043 trillion. That’s the amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in August as part of the debt ceiling compromise, and it is on the law books of the country. This reduced responsible rate will help restore our Nation’s fiscal health.

It is vital that Congress pass this legislation as swiftly as possible. We must prevent a government shutdown, and we have to replenish exhaustive disaster recovery funds which will dry up over the weekend. And just as importantly, we need time to complete work on the fiscal year 2012 appropriations legislation so we can avoid the uncertainty and instability that we saw last year when it took us until April to complete full-year appropriations legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, not only to keep the government running, but also to help the hundreds of thousands of Americans relying on us to get them back on their feet all across the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know as well as anyone that Members change their minds. I’ve heard a lot about that the last couple of days. But here we are debating essentially the same bill that we voted on yesterday. Many Republicans who voted “no” last night did so because they believed \$1.043 trillion is too much spending. The bill before us tonight spends \$1.043 trillion.

I will be the first to say every Member is entitled to change his or her mind; however, I am eager to hear my Republican colleagues who voted “no” yesterday answer why it is okay to vote “yes” today. And I hope these Members will not hang their hat on the one fig leaf of change in the bill. The bill now includes a rescission of \$100 million in emergency funding from section 1705 of the renewables DOE loan program. A rescission of emergency funds does not score as a reduction from the \$1.043 trillion.

Democrats voted “no” for two reasons: we strongly oppose taking funding from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. This is a program that has proven to be a success in creating new jobs, and such a success that the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States have both called upon the Congress to not cut out this program because, one, the money is repaid, and it is creating jobs—something the majority has not done in the months that they’ve been in the majority. This is a jobs program.

We strongly oppose the notion that efforts to help Americans rebuild their

lives after floods, hurricanes, wildfires and other natural disasters should be put on hold until Congress can agree on offsetting reductions in spending. We will continue to vote “no” because the bill continues to acquire an offset to provide disaster relief funding, and that offset is misguided. Republicans take \$1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program at the Department of Energy to pay for \$1 billion in disaster relief.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program was started in 2008 to reinvigorate American manufacturing. To date, the program has awarded \$3.5 billion of credit subsidy to promote energy-efficient advanced vehicles and their component parts. The Department of Energy estimates the loan guarantees have created or maintained 39,000 jobs in California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Some have suggested that this program has been slow to spend emergency funding provided in the FY 2000 CR. I say the loan process ought to be strenuous. One company originally applied under a different loan program in 2006 and received an ATVM loan in 2010. It required 4 years of due diligence and review to qualify for the loan. Republicans seem to be issuing an ultimatum to all loan programs: expedite the review process or see your funding transferred away. By the way, the company in question, Tesla, employed about 400 employees before receiving the loan. Today, they have 1,400 employees in the field of engineering research and development, design, manufacturing, assembly, maintenance, and service, sales and support.

The ATVM program has an additional 18 loan applications in progress that are projected to create 50,000–60,000 more jobs in California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio. One pending application would support investments at 11 plants in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The company employs over 56,000 workers, having added nearly 9,000 new workers since 2009. Some of these jobs will be at risk because of this offset.

This is not the time to put American manufacturing jobs at risk.

□ 2330

That is why the National Association of Manufacturers expressed their support for the ATVM program in a letter to the Senate dated September 22, noting, “The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.” And the Chamber of Commerce agrees with them.

Now, I think it’s time for us to stay with our position and vote “no” and get a clean CR. That’s what I asked the committee to do. We need a clean CR. We don’t need this offset.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the distinguished chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2608, to provide the continuing resolution for the initial weeks. And I want to be sure that we keep the government open. And by passing this bill, we will keep the government open.

This bill is needed to keep vital government services and programs operating past the end of the fiscal year on September 30. As the gentleman from Kentucky has stated, the Committee on Appropriations has made great progress in moving 11 of the 12 annual bills. However, additional time is needed for the consideration of the other.

This continuing resolution, for anyone who questions it, conforms to the spending reduction targets that were agreed to by the House, the Senate, and the White House. It's exactly the same number, and so no reason to vote against it. Specifically, the bill sets an annual rate that reduces overall discretionary spending by 1.5 percent from fiscal year 2011.

In addition, the bill provides disaster funding to provide much-needed assistance to individuals and communities suffering from hurricane and flood damage. The State of Virginia has been hit, as many others.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill. By voting for the bill, we will keep the government open.

The American people sometimes think this institution and this town is dysfunctional. We can ensure that we can do our work. Pass this bill.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee and former chair.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Just yesterday this continuing resolution failed because of widespread concerns with the plan to offset disaster relief funding from a key Department of Energy program. One day later we're having the exact same debate. The only thing that's changed is that the Republican majority has decided this time to target two Energy Department programs instead of one.

When the measure failed yesterday, House Republican leaders faced a basic decision. They could give up their efforts to hold disaster funding hostage to another partisan budget battle by removing the offset and passing the bill with a broad bipartisan majority.

Or they could make the measure even more extreme in order to cater to the most radical members of their party, without concern for the fact that FEMA is just days away from running out of money, and communities around the country are waiting desperately for the support that's been promised them.

Now, anybody who's been watching this Congress for the last 8 months should not be the least surprised by the majority's decision. Once again, Republicans have put partisan ideology ahead of the dire needs of the American people and are risking yet another destabilizing standoff over spending cuts in the process.

So now we're debating, under a martial-law rule, a bill that is even worse than it was yesterday. It still seeks to pay for urgent disaster relief needs by taking money from a major job-creating program at the Department of Energy.

As I said in this Chamber yesterday, this is a radical departure from the way we have treated emergency disaster relief in the past. Over the past 10 years, Congress has approved 16 supplementals that included emergency funding for FEMA disaster relief in response to disasters such as 9/11, Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Ike, and floods on the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers. None of these emergency appropriations for the disaster relief fund were paid for with cuts to other Federal programs.

Yesterday I heard several of my friends on the other side of the aisle claim that we've offset disaster assistance numerous times over the past decade. This is simply not accurate. Some of the supplemental bills that included disaster relief also included offsets, but these offsets were used to pay for entirely separate programs, never for FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund.

As I said yesterday, this insistence on offsets is bad precedent, and it's bad policy. It leaves disaster-affected communities in the lurch while undermining our economic recovery by cannibalizing an Energy Department program that stands to add tens of thousands of good-paying jobs in an industry critical to our future economic competitiveness.

And it goes even further than that by including a gratuitous and arbitrary rescission to another Department of Energy loan program, a change aimed at scoring political points against the President and winning Tea Party votes. But it has very little to do with balancing the budget or providing relief for those in need.

Moreover, rather than approving a bill that would win passage in the Senate, we are now sending over a measure that the Senate majority is on record opposing, causing more economic uncertainty, risking yet another manufactured crisis.

So, Mr. Speaker, I once again urge colleagues to oppose this measure, to support the Senate's approach to disaster relief instead, which would fully fund FEMA's needs without holding them hostage to another partisan budget battle.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I thank the distinguished chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this must-pass resolution. This CR not only keeps the government operating, but it provides a substantial infusion of desperately needed funding totaling \$3.65 billion for disaster relief and emergency flood control efforts.

That's funding to sustain disaster relief efforts in hard-hit States all across this Nation, including the devastation that hit my home State of Alabama back in April of this year. That's funding to address the record flooding up and down the Mississippi River and along the east coast resulting from Hurricane Irene. That's funding to help tens of thousands of people who have lost virtually everything but the shirts on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, the time for talk and the time for politicking is over. It's time to pass this vital resolution, provide our Nation with necessary disaster relief funding, avert a government shutdown, allow Congress to scrub the administration's full disaster supplemental request, provide the needed oversight, and complete the work on the FY 2012 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital resolution and responsibly address our Nation's most pressing needs.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member of the Energy and Water appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the measure.

During the debate on the rule on this measure, Joplin, Missouri was mentioned quite often. But I would mention that there is an emergency as far as Tuscaloosa, Alabama, is concerned; Hamburg, Iowa, is concerned; Cairo, Illinois, is concerned; Springfield, Massachusetts, certainly; Joplin, Missouri; Smithville, Mississippi; Williston, North Dakota; States like Vermont.

Subsequent to the rains and floods of this spring, we've had earthquakes, we've had wildfires, we had hurricanes.

The current need of the Army Corps is about \$2.257 billion, so the first observation I would make is the offsets that are set aside in this bill are certainly inadequate to cover that amount.

But there is a further emergency in this country, and that is the fact that, as of August of this year, there were 13,967,000 Americans who were without work. In the year 2000, 8 percent of the people who live in the great State of Indiana were living in poverty. Today, 16 percent of the people in the State of Indiana are living in poverty, and for those we represent who are working today, for 1 hour's worth of their labor, they're making 53 cents less today in real purchasing power than they did in 1977.

□ 2340

Today, there are 6,643,000 less Americans working in manufacturing making a living wage than there were in 1977.

So the response is let's take \$1.5 billion out of an investment account where there are still 10 pending applications to try to make cars in this country more efficiently, more fuel efficient, and more desirable for consumers.

But earlier tonight we heard, Don't worry; the Chinese are going to help our car companies with financing. I'm affronted by that possibility. That's why we need this \$1.5 billion so maybe we could still make cars in the United States of America without the help of the Chinese Government.

I think this is a wrongheaded approach.

And then let's pile on. There's obviously a controversy about a solar company in California. I think perhaps it is a matter to be considered not only by oversight in the United States Congress but the Justice Department. But that's not a decision for us to make if wrongdoing has occurred. But you know what? Let's take it out on somebody else. Let's make sure there is not money available for other legitimate companies who are trying to increase jobs in this country and who are trying to reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

That wasn't the response I saw in this body in 2008. We had the major financial institutions in this country drive our economy into the ground. Did we ask them to give back their tax advantages? Did we punish them in any way? We gave them money. We should at least pick on somebody our own size.

We didn't ask anybody in Iraq or Afghanistan whether or not they needed an offset for emergency money for schools, for hospitals, for bridges. The people in Joplin, the people in Vermont, the people in these other communities, they need our help now. Traditionally, we have recognized the emergency, we have declared the emergency, and we have helped them out.

And when Bill Clinton was President of the United States, we declared emergencies like this on three occasions in 1998, 1999, and 2001, and we balanced the budget.

I oppose this measure.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield 3 minutes to a brand new Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. My father taught me a long time ago not to make a speech or give an opinion unless I thought it was important. I think tonight it's important, and I hope that you also think it's important.

I would never question anyone's motives and ideals. However, we are here tonight to meet the immediate needs of the people that we represent.

This vote is not about politics. This vote is not about Republicans or Democrats. This vote is not about cut or not cut. This vote is about coming to the aid of the American people whom we

represent, the people who have been devastated by floods. People like friends and neighbors, seniors and children in the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and on the east coast. It is heartbreaking and it is heart wrenching. You must see it firsthand to understand it.

The Federal Government's main purpose is to protect its citizens from disaster, both from terrorism and from natural disasters.

My staff and I stood in mud, waste, and stagnant water over the last 3 weeks along with families who lost everything: furniture, clothes, photos, toys stacked outside of their homes that were destroyed or condemned. If each of you stood where I stood, I know in my heart that because you are compassionate, this bill would have been passed by now.

I tried to comfort children who were sitting in cars or on car rooftops and in truck beds because they could not get into their home that was condemned and filled with the same stagnant mud and water and waste and snakes that were outside their homes. I talked to grown men that were crying because their homes were destroyed and asked me, Where am I going to safely put my family tonight?

A little girl not more than 8 years old asked me where she was going to sleep because she no longer had her bed and her bedroom in which she and her sister slept.

Seniors were trapped on the second floor of their home because the first floor was flooded. Small businesses were completely wiped out.

I plead with you, I implore you, I beg you to pass this flood relief now for our people who do not have the basic comforts that those of us here have. The American people are depending on us to give them a hand up, and they deserve our immediate attention.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee, Mr. FATTAH of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. If we could have a vote to provide disaster relief, every Member in this Chamber would cast a vote in the affirmative. What we're asked to make tonight is a Solomon-like choice between tens of thousands of jobs for Americans who desperately need them and a limited amount of disaster relief. That is not a fair choice.

And I guess the majority wasn't happy with the polling that showed that only 12 percent of the public thought that Congress was doing a good job or 13 percent. We dropped to 12. I guess we're trying to get into the single digits.

What we need to do is to do our work. Now, this is a program where Ford Motor Company borrowed a loan guarantee at 5.9 to put people to work, some 30,000 people to work in Michigan and Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio. This is a program that's working, that taxpayers' money is paid back through these loan guarantees.

The National Association of Manufacturers in today's National Journal says that we now, as we have, lead the world in manufacturing with 21 percent of globally manufactured products. But China is now in second place at 15 and Japan has dropped to third at 12. Why would we want to concede our leadership in this world in manufacturing?

In the Republican decade under the Bush White House we lost 350,000 manufacturing jobs. We saw tens of thousands of small manufacturers close down in our Nation. Now, this administration, people talk about the number in August, but let's look at the entire 20 months of the Obama recovery—2½ million jobs led by increases consistently in manufacturing.

I ask that we reject this CR. I hope that the majority would come to the House with an approach that would actually respond to the disasters that we face without asking us to put more Americans out of work.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. It is a responsible measure. It makes good on the promises we must keep to members of our military, to our veterans, and to Americans who rely upon the essential functions of the Federal Government.

It cares for the needs of millions of Americans who have suffered from the effects of dramatic natural disasters, including the folks in my State of Missouri who live in Joplin, who live along the Mississippi in my specific district, who live along the Missouri River in the northern part of our State.

□ 2350

These folks can't wait another day for help because people are playing politics with this bill. The House and the Appropriations Committee are dedicated to a responsible process, and this bill reflects the amount of time needed to complete that work.

I think we've realized this year on both sides of the aisle that we have to bring the size and the spending of the Federal Government into line with reality. In the hearings and markups that we've conducted in the House and in the negotiations to make specific and significant spending cuts, not only this year but also in each of the next 10, and through the budget process, we have laid the groundwork for a new era of stewardship for our taxpayer dollars.

In addition to our covenant with members of the military, with veterans, with the families depending on a helping hand up, and for Americans who are really suffering from true emergencies that have devastated their homes, like Mr. MARINO said—their jobs and their lives—we do have a responsibility to the American taxpayer and to future generations who cringe

at the sight of our debt and our deficits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows us to work in good faith, to make good on both our promises and our responsibilities. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to, once again, put politics aside and support it here tonight.

Mr. DICKS. Would the Speaker tell us how much time both sides have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 14½ minutes left, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 18 minutes left.

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

Today was a very dramatic day on the stock market. The Dow Jones dropped 500 points because investors are worried that we're headed into a second recession; and what we get from the majority party is to cut out a program that creates jobs. The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program has already created 39,000 jobs. It's going to create another 39,000 with the \$2.5 billion that remains, and the \$1.5 billion that we're taking out of there would create another 10,000 jobs. These are jobs. The only way we're going to get unemployment down is to put people back to work.

And here we are again. After saving all these other programs—cutting people out of work in the public sector—now we're going to cut out automobile jobs. Let me read to you what the National Association of Manufacturers has to say, which is not an organ of the Democratic Party:

"The NAM is the largest trade association in the United States, representing over 11,000 small, medium and large manufacturers in all 50 States. We are the leading voice for the manufacturing economy, which provides millions of high-wage jobs in the U.S. Two-thirds of our members are small businesses, which serve as the engine for job growth. Our mission is to enhance the competitiveness of manufacturers and improve American living standards by shaping a legislative and regulatory environment conducive to U.S. economic growth.

"The NAM is writing to express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—this is the program that we're taking \$1.5 billion out of"—authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs and put our Nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

I mean, if you had to go out and find a business group in this country that has more credibility, I don't know what it would be. It's the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Chamber of Commerce, which is also not an organ of the Democratic

Party, says: "As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program.

"First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes.

"Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that is critical to the Nation's recovery.

"Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry. Numerous loan applications have been in the queue for years, waiting for the administration to complete its due diligence."

That line started in the previous administration. So this is a jobs program.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we want to take care of those people who have suffered disasters. We want to take care of them. We will take care of them, but we also want to provide jobs for Americans who are unemployed. If I were in your shoes, I'd support jobs for workers and also take care of those people who are suffering because of a disaster.

Now, these are Republican-leaning organizations. They get it. Just vote "no," and let's get a clean bill and do the right thing for the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Interior appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I loved listening to the gentleman from Washington's debate. Now, if the gentleman wants to really create some jobs in this country, we can create hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs if we'll start getting oil going back in the gulf and permitted. The gentleman talked about not being so reliant on foreign oil. We've got rigs right now that were in the gulf that are off the coast of Africa because they can't get permitted in the gulf. Now, do you want to create millions of jobs? Join us on that, and let's create millions of jobs.

The gentleman talked about, geez, he just doesn't understand how people could change their votes. People actually sometimes learn more information and decide that they were wrong the time before and that now they'll change their votes, just like some people on that side of the aisle who actually issue press releases saying that they were going to support this CR and then change their minds. That's okay.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I didn't put out a press release, but I'll tell you one thing. I listen. I listen to the Chamber of Commerce and to the National Association of Manufacturers. I listen.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this continuing resolution. This CR is vital to keeping our government operating over the next 7 weeks while Congress completes its work on next year's budget.

It's worth reminding Members that tonight this CR actually reduces spending from last year's enacted levels and saves taxpayers billions of dollars. The irony is that voting against this CR is actually a vote for more spending. If you want to reduce government spending, then you should vote for this CR. It's pretty simple, really.

FEMA's coffers for disaster assistance are about to run dry. There is no such thing as a Republican natural disaster or a Democrat natural disaster. The last thing Congress should do is hold up disaster assistance because of partisan politics. We need to approve this CR tonight and get the relief to those in need as quickly as humanly possible.

Now, I've got to tell you, in all honesty, I'm not one of those people who believes that we have to offset every emergency. We have done some in the past—some we have not—but in the past, we have not had a \$14 trillion deficit. That's the danger to this country is the \$14 trillion deficit and the \$1.6 trillion we add to it every damned year.

I've got to admit, this is only \$1 billion. But do you know what? Some people say, Oh, that's only \$1 billion. I heard one Member say yesterday it was nickels and dimes. In Idaho, \$1 billion is not nickels and dimes. We did not get into this situation a trillion dollars at a time. We got here a million and a billion dollars at a time, and that's how we're going to get out of this situation. So let's do our job and do what's right for the country and get this deficit under control; and if we can offset it, let's offset it.

□ 0000

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members to refrain from using profanity in debate.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This is not a debate over compassion. This is not a debate over who cares more about the people in Joplin or the people in Vermont. This is a debate about what the Republicans, what the Tea Party has decided to use as an excuse, as a guise to finish off the revolution that the Democrats

have put in place that changes our relationship with where we get our energy from.

Big Oil and Big Coal have fought solar, wind, all-electric vehicles, biomass, geothermal, that entire revolution because they know that it will eat into their profits.

So a disaster occurs that each of us wants to respond to. The Republicans, responding to the oil and coal industry, say this is our chance to kill the revolution that makes it possible to have vehicles go 50, 60, 80, 100 miles a gallon without oil, no oil, that makes it possible for us to have wind and solar generate the electricity that will fuel those vehicles without sending greenhouse gases up into the atmosphere, which is changing our climate and leading to these storms, leading to these floods, leading to these disasters that then needs FEMA, need the relief that we give to these families. So they take the chance, they take the opportunity to kill the very programs which are the solution to these disasters which are being created here in our country and around the world, the agenda of Big Oil and Big Coal.

And the temerity of it all is that they know that the automotive program has already created 39,000 jobs in our country over the last 3 years and that this one cut that they are talking about tonight will kill 10,000 jobs over the next year. In the solar industry—and, by the way, they cut out \$100 million in solar and wind guarantees as well.

Right now, ladies and gentlemen, there are 85,000 jobs in the wind industry, almost all of them created in the last 4 years. There are 85,000 jobs in the coal industry. In other words, in the last 5 years, wind now equals the entire coal industry. There are 100,000 jobs in the solar industry, and last year we were a net exporter to China; 100,000 jobs in solar, 85,000 jobs in wind, and it is the future.

The oil industry laid off 20,000 employees over the last 3 years. Let us talk here about future, about young people, about this planet, about backing out the oil from OPEC so we can tell them we don't need their oil any more than we need their sand. That's what this debate is about tonight.

And under the guise, with these crocodile tears of how much they care about the victims, as though it's any greater on our side, they are using it as the guise to kill these programs. That's what it's all about tonight. That's why we're angry. That's what this is all about.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true that these alternative energy programs all create jobs?

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

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

Don't they all create jobs, these alternative energy programs? So instead of just having the automobile program that creates jobs cut by \$1.5 billion, now they are taking \$100 million out of another program that creates jobs for the American people, so this is a double header.

Mr. MARKEY. They could have taken this money out of the \$41 million of gas breaks for the oil and gas industry, but, no, they take it out of solar, they take it out of wind.

And by the way, wind and solar, with the same amount of money, creates five times more jobs than an investment in fossil fuels does. So they keep the money in for the programs that create three to five times less jobs than the program they are knee-capping here this evening. That's what this vote is all about.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is Solyndra part of the revolution that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MARKEY. Solyndra will receive no money under this program.

Who will receive this money? Indiana will receive the money.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

The program was started under the previous administration, the Bush administration. The last day they tried to force it out, to have it approved, and it was turned down by the good staff at the Department of Energy.

Mr. MARKEY. So they will not receive a nickel under this program. The oil and gas industry will receive that money as they tip the people of our country upside down and shake the money out of their pockets.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) a valued member of our committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, what the previous gentlemen did not say is that Solyndra received \$500 million because they have friends in high places. Despite even people in this administration who said don't do it, they received \$500 million. If that was in a different country, we wouldn't call it waste; we would call it corruption. But we won't do that here. The gentleman didn't say that.

He talks about the revolution. This cuts \$100 million from a program that gave because of influence, because of friends in high places, because of bundlers of campaign contribution funds to a corporation that went bankrupt and laid off a thousand people after receiving this money.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I would just point out that one of the largest investors was

Walmart, and Walmart has a long history of supporting Republican candidates. And I will just say, I will just say they invested, I think, \$3 or \$400 million. So there was a lot of private sector investment here, too.

I appreciate it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I reclaim my time.

Despite what the gentleman says, Mr. Speaker, the previous President's administration denied the funding for Solyndra because they knew it was a scam, regardless of anything else. This administration did that.

Now, the reason we have to support this CR—let's cut politics aside. Let's not talk about revolutions of money blown like stimulus money, that was blown. The reason this CR makes sense is because there are people who are suffering from natural disasters. This CR funds that program and it helps them out. And the reason this is important is because it controls the size and the cost of the Federal Government that is totally out of control.

So no more gimmicks, no more giveaways to friends of friends because of high pressure.

Let's pass this CR so we can keep the government rolling, so we can slow down the growth of government, and so we can help the victims without corruption of those who have friends in high places.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a valued member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this continuing resolution. It will fund the government through November 18. It takes care of many of our disaster needs.

As you heard from my colleague so eloquently, Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania, you heard about the plight of so many people in towns like Shickshinny and West Pittston who are living in the front yard in the cars. People are broken. Communities have been ruined, and so we need to pass this bill.

I urge you to support this bill.

□ 0010

I've heard a lot of talk tonight about manufacturing. My dad's family spent 100 years making industrial hardware in Pennsylvania. If you really care about manufacturing, some of you might have considered voting for a bill last week to allow the Nation's largest exporter to open up a billion-dollar facility in the State of South Carolina to hire a thousand people to make aircraft. If you really want to help manufacturing, you should've voted for that bill.

You can also help us in stopping EPA's assault on the coal industry and on the cement industry. I represent the largest cement-producing district in America. These industries are in trouble, and they're under assault by this EPA. Help us. There'll be measures considered here to deal with them.

If you are truly concerned about manufacturing, innovation and research, you wouldn't have slapped a 2.3 percent tax on medical devices. It's going to kill tens of thousands of jobs in this country. We make a lot of devices in my part of the world, in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. We need help. Our manufacturers need help.

So rather than defending a company out in California that just wasted \$500 million, down the drain, taxpayer dollars, 1,100 people out of work, let's do something to help manufacturers. And most importantly, let's pass this bill tonight to help so many people who are struggling throughout this country in Pennsylvania; New Jersey; New York; Vermont; the people of the South; Joplin, Missouri; and elsewhere who have been affected by these horrible natural disasters. Please, stand up, do the right thing and vote for this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a hardworking member of our committee and a newcomer to the Congress.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the time.

I know the hour is late. It's been a long time. Soon we will complete action on this temporary spending measure for 2012. Obviously, it is work that has to be done. As my friend, the distinguished Rules Committee chairman appropriately quoted earlier this evening: the process has been ugly. It has been messy; but it works.

The good news is that most of America has gone to bed and not witness to the bickering and rancor evidenced in this Chamber. I can only hope that when they wake up tomorrow, we will have done the people's work, funding government beyond October 1, giving necessary funding to the victims of natural disasters, and doing it such a way that promotes the kind of fiscal responsibility long demanded by the people of America.

It will be sad, indeed tragic, if when the sun comes up tomorrow, this Congress, instead of bringing certainty and relief to those struggling, as this CR does, we impose yet another threat of a government shutdown and more uncertainty into an already skeptical populace.

This legislation up until yesterday, Mr. Speaker, had bipartisan support. And only because my friends on the other side of the aisle recognized that many on our side preferred much deeper cuts and might be predisposed to opposing the CR, they pounced on it. And quickly, in an instant, that bipartisan support disappeared into the bowels of the business as usual. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it was politics ahead of the people.

Let's remember that this CR we'll vote on in the next few minutes was crafted based on the numbers outlined

in the BCA approved in this Chamber just a few weeks ago, complete with desperately need disaster funding, reasonably and responsibly offset.

I urge my colleagues to support the CR.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a member of the committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The question we're debating tonight is not whether we give aid and assistance to those of our neighbors that have been hit by serious disasters. We all agree that's the appropriate thing to do. The question is do we cut spending elsewhere to pay for that assistance.

Now, what our friends on the left have told us is, look, that's not the way we've done it in the past. In fact, we've always done it by just going ahead and spending without any offset. Doing it the way we've always done it has put us \$14 trillion in debt.

What we have to do is exactly what the people of Monroe County, Mississippi did on the night of April 26. Those families had dreams. They had hopes; they had plans. And on April 27, the tornados hit and their plans changed, and they redirected their spending plans to take care of the disaster. Now, if the families in Monroe County, Mississippi have done that, they have every reason to expect their government to do the same thing.

Now, we've been told, But we need some government program to create jobs. If we will give the American people the assurance that their government is serious about cutting spending like this bill does, we'll give them the confidence to create jobs. If we remove the regulatory burdens, American businesses will create jobs. And if we give them the assurance that we're not going to raise their taxes, the American economy will thrive and create jobs.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished whip of the Democratic Party, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of my goodest, best friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 4¾ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a legislative arena, not a coliseum to attack one another. It is a legislative arena to try to come together to do what the American public expects us to do.

There are at least two crises confronting the American people, and perhaps three. First of all, they are concerned about the fiscal posture of this country. They're right. We need to address that.

Secondly, they're concerned about jobs. And immediately, as the gentleman from Mississippi just pointed out, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke earlier, they are concerned about the disasters that have put them at risk. And I suggest to you the people in your district and in my district who don't have a job, who aren't sure how they are going to pay their mortgage and aren't sure that they are going to be able to buy food tomorrow believe that they too have been confronted with a disaster. They want us to deal with all three of those items and, yes, perhaps more.

Many of you have stood on this floor and said we need to act now to help these people who have been the victims of hurricane, of quake, of fire, of flood. Now, if you want to act now, what you bring to this floor is a bill that is not controversial so it does not get mired in this bickering back and forth, because we care deeply about responding now.

This bill has never enjoyed bipartisan support from my perspective, and I told your whip that on Tuesday. There was no surprise. We believe strongly that the provision that you have put in this bill is detrimental to working people and the expansion of our economy. You perhaps do not agree on that. Perhaps we have a legitimate item of disagreement. And so if you were really concerned about those flood victims, about those hurricane victims, you would have taken that out and met that issue another day. But you chose not to do that.

You chose to continue the partisan path of placing at risk the continued funding of government through November 18, which you have all expressed a desire to do, and jobs, not that Democrats say are advantaged by the provision you want to strike, but the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

□ 0020

They say it puts jobs at risk. Your folks in Pennsylvania, I tell my friend, will not be helped if this bill continues to be mired in partisan differences. And you knew there was a partisan difference, and notwithstanding that, you brought it back to this floor. Now I understand there are some of you that were concerned that this was \$1.043 trillion rather than \$1.019 trillion. That's been changed for you now. And I'm sure all your Tea Party friends are going to be very enthusiastic that for four-tenths of a percent you perhaps have changed your vote. My, my, my. Four-tenths of a percent. That's the difference in this bill from a fiscal perspective.

My friends, Americans need our help. They don't need Republican help or Democratic help; they need all of our help. They need it now. They need it not mired in partisan bickering, as my friend said from Arkansas. They need us to come together on that which we can agree, giving our folks help when

they need it—now. And I will tell you that the Senate determined that there was twice the need—indeed, three times the need—that you have determined.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's defeat this bill and let's bring tonight or tomorrow morning a bill that I guarantee you will pass overwhelmingly in this House.

Yesterday, we were hoping to vote—Democrats and Republicans together—on a bipartisan bill to fund the Government through November according to the budget deal we had agreed upon.

We did vote together, as it turns out, in bipartisan opposition, though for very different reasons.

Democrats opposed it because it was too extreme, endangering emergency funding to help our constituents hit by disasters and threatening to cut from a program that actually creates jobs.

Some Republicans voted against the CR because it wasn't extreme enough.

Now, we have been waiting all day for the Republican leadership to send us a bipartisan bill that should have voted on yesterday.

Unfortunately, the bill we're voting on tonight shows they didn't receive the message.

Not only have they put forward the same bill that failed yesterday, with the same troublesome offset and cuts as before, they have worsened it by casting a line to extreme members of their party.

Those Members who wanted an additional \$24 billion cut yesterday, I suspect, will not be lured by \$100 million tonight.

That is just four tenths of one percent of what they were demanding.

This new addition to the bill, which would cut loans for the construction of renewable energy projects that create jobs, is essentially an empty political attack on the administration.

Now is not the time for political games.

The American people want us to get serious on the deficit, and we had agreed on a way to do so.

They want us to get serious on jobs and this CR does just the opposite.

The CR we need to pass is one that adheres to the August budget deal.

There is already bipartisan agreement in the Senate on how to handle emergency disaster assistance, and we should follow that example.

Let's have a vote on a CR we can pass, one the senate can pass, and one that isn't set up to drive the parties further apart on budgetary issues.

Let's see a version that will bring us together.

As I said yesterday, I am ready to cast my vote for that CR, and I know other Democrats feel the same way.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this version, and I sincerely hope the Republican leadership will recognize why and work with us to do what's best for our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

This really is a simple bill. It's merely a bridge to get us until November

the 18th to continue the government basically as is until that time, to get us time to work with the Senate to put together the funding for all of fiscal 2012. NORM DICKS and I started out this year agreeing that we wanted to restore regular order to the Appropriations Committee and the process. And we've worked in that regard. The committee has dealt with 11 of the 12 appropriations bills. Six of them you've had a chance on the floor to amend and pass, which you have.

Unfortunately, our brethren across the Capitol have been a little bit slow, and they passed one bill, which necessitated that we do something to continue the government while we try to work with them to bring them along on their bills and fund fiscal 2012.

This bill started out as a bipartisan bill. We worked to make it so. But along the way, on the eve of the bill, all of a sudden we were confronted with a partisan attack from this side of the aisle, and we had no choice but to respond. But still yet this is a bipartisanly constructed bill. It doesn't attack anyone.

The Homeland Security bill that passed the body, you will recall, carried the provision that required that the billion dollars in that bill for FEMA would be offset from the automobile account that's been discussed. That passed this body in a bipartisan vote. Many Democrats voted for it, joined Republicans. No one raised a concern—until this bill came to the floor. And all of a sudden, there was this great eruption of partisanship on that side of the aisle, which I am very sad about.

But we will muddle through. This is a good bill. It funds your government at the level that was agreed to by the parties in the House, Senate, and White House, the level that is now the law. It funds us until November 18. And by then we hope to have worked out with our Senate brethren and sisters the funding for the rest of fiscal 2012.

So, the hour is late. Time is short. We've made up our minds. Let's vote.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, here they go again—House Republicans are driving America once more to the brink. They took us to the edge of a shutdown in April. They shoved us to the precipice of America's first ever default in August. And now after their similar attempt failed yesterday, House Republicans are again playing politics with the American economy, and American families.

Hurricane Irene leveled homes and businesses in the Northeast. An earthquake destroyed businesses in Mineral, Virginia. In my district, Tropical Storm Lee left hundreds of families homeless and damaged dozens of small businesses. And yet in this Continuing Resolution, House Republicans state they will only help those in extremis if we gut the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—a successful program that spurs American innovation and creates American jobs.

In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urged the retention of this important program stating it "promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component."

Americans don't need brinkmanship; they need predictability and security. This Continuing Resolution gives them neither. I would urge my colleagues to reject it in favor of one that protects Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2608, "The Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011," which provides for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 at the expense of job creating efforts.

The bill before us today is almost identical to the bill that we voted against yesterday. Mr. Speaker the bill before us will hurt jobs. The central issue before our country is jobs and the creation of jobs to secure our economy. We need to focus on talking about jobs. Instead, we are now once again focused on a measure that was rejected yesterday. The amendment added to this bill is clearly a desperate attempt by my Republican colleagues to pass their own ideological Continuing Resolution. This amendment would keep the same offset for disaster relief which will result in a \$1.5 billion cut to the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM), which has been a proven job creator, it created 35,000 jobs in the private sector. The purpose of the program is to enable American businesses to build the cars of the future that could be sold to China, rather than the reverse. It is intended to give us a technological boast in the auto industry. As if this was not enough, the amendment adds an additional cut—a rescission of \$100 million from the Recovery Act Renewable Energy Loan guarantee program, which is another cut to a program that creates jobs. A move to secure the votes of members concerned about the few party interests not the interests of Americans. This legislation causes the loss of American jobs!

The only broken record that I want to hear is the mantra of how to create jobs. Let us focus on putting the American people back to work, rather than bringing back measures that failed to garner support yesterday. I implore my colleagues to recall the reasons they rejected this measure in the first place and to do so again. Americans have always come to the aid of those in need, after a natural disaster.

Americans demonstrate a level of compassion that should not be damped by measures like the one before us today. Disaster relief funding is not a political football; it addresses the needs of Americans who find themselves the victims of unforeseeable natural disasters. It is born out of our nation's desire to aid those who are in need.

Now . . . now is not the time to trample on the needs of small business owners. Now is not the time to delay assistance to those who need support from FEMA. Now is not the time for a partisan position that will only cause more Americans to suffer while they have to wait on Congress to find balance. Now is the time for balance and reason.

Small businesses have long been the bedrock of our nation's economy. Even with the advent of modern-day multi-national corporations most of our day-to-day purchases take place at "mom and pop" small businesses.

This piece of legislation holds small businesses hostage in order to make a demand that has never been made by Republicans before. This demand changes their practice during previous administrations. In the past my

colleagues declared disaster funding as emergency spending and did not require offsetting emergency spending.

This bill would offset the \$1 billion in FY11 disaster relief funding using a program that is a proven job-creator, a program for small businesses. The very small businesses that are currently in need of access to loans and other lines of credit in order to build their businesses and create jobs. The very small businesses that are the life blood of our economy. These businesses, the “mom and pop” shops across our nation are being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle at the expense of jobs.

The future successes of their businesses are being held hostage in order to demand offsets of funds that have not required such an offset in the past. These funds would aid victims of natural disasters. To propose such a measure at a time when our economy is so fragile and when so many are struggling to survive is unfathomable.

At a time when our nation needs every single job we can create. Before us is a job killing measure. We need job creation to help families survive on smaller and smaller pay checks. Before us is legislation that places a halt on this growth. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the first time in our nation's history have added to this piece of legislation a requirement that disaster aid be offset. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) needs the \$6.9 billion in funding which has been approved in the Senate last week without requiring offset. My colleagues have cut this funding in half. They have offset this funding by decreasing the funds allotted by ending the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. These cuts cost Americans tens of thousands of jobs. Under the previous administration Republicans supported disaster relief without requiring an offset, on eight separate occasions but today they want to require cuts that will result in job loss.

As the Representative for Houston, which suffered severe damage in 2008 as a result of Hurricane Ike, I understand the importance of cleanup and rebuilding in the wake of natural disaster. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) addresses the challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

We must fund disaster relief. These are unforeseeable events. The devastating hurricanes in Texas in recent years is a perfect example. Our response to those events have demonstrated a need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Katrina, there were insufficient quantities of generators that forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

We must prepare our first responders with the best information and training to quickly analyze and share information to understand alerts and warning systems, evacuation plan-

ning, mission assignments to other agencies, contingency contracting, pre-staged resources, Regional Hurricane Plans and exercises, communications support, citizen preparedness, disaster housing, and long-term recovery planning. In order to accomplish this we must fund FEMA, not at the expense of small business but because Americans come together at times of crisis. This should be what it has always been—emergency funding.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the federal government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our Nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

On any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents. Cities and towns across the Nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises. Consider the devastation that was brought by the tornadoes in Alabama and the Southern United States, the flooding that has impacted the entire Mississippi River region, from Montana to Tennessee, and tornado that claimed more than 100 lives in Joplin, Missouri, have shown us that there are disasters we cannot predict, and forces of nature for which we cannot plan.

This legislation is a job killer, it is an affront to growing small businesses and will destroy thousands of jobs. I have been firmly committed to supporting small businesses and this legislation as written will fail to help create the jobs we need at this time. We should not prevent the growth of small business in order to address the unrealistic demands related to disaster relief funding.

Moreover, 99 percent of all independent companies and businesses in the United States are considered small businesses. They are the engine of our economy, creating two-thirds of the new jobs over the last 15 years. America's 27 million small businesses continue to face a lack of credit and tight lending standards, with the number of small businesses' loans down nearly 5 million since the financial crisis in 2008.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, these small businesses account for 52 percent of all U.S. workers. These small businesses also provide a continuing source of vitality for the American economy. Small businesses in the U.S. produced three-fourths of the economy's new jobs between 1990 and 1995, and represent an entry point into the economy for new groups. Women, for instance, participate heavily in small businesses.

The number of female-owned businesses climbed by 89 percent, to an estimated 8.1 million, between 1987 and 1997, and women-

owned sole proprietorships were expected to reach 35 percent of all such ventures by the year 2000. Small firms also tend to hire a greater number of older workers and people who prefer to work part-time.

A major strength of small businesses is their ability to respond quickly to changing economic conditions. They often know their customers personally and are especially suited to meet local needs. There are tons of stories of start-up companies catching national attention and growing into large corporations. Just a few examples of these types of start-up businesses making big include the computer software company Microsoft; the package delivery service Federal Express; sports clothing manufacturer Nike; the computer networking firm America OnLine; and ice cream maker Ben & Jerry's.

We must always ensure that we place a high level of priority on small businesses. It is also important that we work towards ensuring that small businesses receive all the tools and resources necessary for their continued growth and development.

American small businesses are the heart beat of our nation. I believe that small businesses represent more than the American dream—they represent the American economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of all employers, create half of our gross domestic product, and provide three out of four new jobs in this country.

Small business growth means economic growth for the nation. But to keep this segment of our economy thriving, entrepreneurs need access to loans. Through loans, small business owners can expand their businesses, hire more workers and provide more goods and services. The Small Business Administration (SBA), a federal organization that aids small businesses with loan and development programs, is a key provider of support to small businesses. The SBA's main loan program accounts for 30 percent of all long-term small business borrowing in America.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential. That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs. These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing. We must consider what impact changes in this appropriations bill will have on small businesses.

There are 5.8 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy. In 2007, minority owned businesses employed nearly 6 million Americans and generated \$1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% since 2002, and currently total close to 8 million. These organizations make up more than half of all businesses in health care and social assistance.

My home city of Houston, Texas is home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

According to a 2009 report published by the Economic Policy Institute, “Starting in 2004, the Small Business Administration (SBA) set goals for small business participation in federal contracts. It encouraged agencies to award contracts to companies owned by women, veterans, and minorities or those located in economically challenged areas and

gave them benchmarks to work toward. The targets are specific: 23% of contracts to small business, 5% to woman-owned small businesses, and 3% to disabled veteran-owned and HUBZone small businesses.”

Women and minority owned businesses generate billions of dollars and employ millions of people. They are certainly qualified to receive these contracts. A mandatory DOD outreach program women and minority owned businesses aware of all of the contract opportunities available to them.

Facts: Small businesses are important because they:

(1) Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms,

(2) Employ just over half of all private sector employees,

(3) Pay 44 percent of total U.S. private payroll,

(4) Generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years,

(5) Create more than half of the nonfarm private gross domestic product (GDP),

(6) Hire 40 percent of high tech workers (such as scientists, engineers, and computer programmers),

(7) Are 52 percent home-based and 2 percent franchises,

(8) Made up 97.3 percent of all identified exporters and produced 30.2 percent of the known export value in FY 2007,

(9) Produce 13 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms and twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the one percent most cited.

Republicans appear to be a mission to cut programs that help families and will buttress small businesses. At a time when there are Americans faced with the perils which arise during cleaning up after a natural disaster. Now is not the time to force those Americans to wait on a partisan battle, to pick a fight that has not been fought in eight previous authorizations of funds for disaster relief. There needs to be a balance when determining which programs to cut and when. A balance to finding the funds that will address national disasters. A balanced approach is important to ensuring that small business receive the support they need.

I stand here once again asking my colleagues to remember that just yesterday we opposed this bill. I implore you to do this once more. I support small business and job creation. I will not support small business growth being held hostage to the unrealistic demands made by my Republican colleagues. American families need measures that are job growers rather than measures that are jobs killers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 727]

AYES—219

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourrette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

NOES—203

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper

Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Deutch
Giffords
Gohmert

Gonzalez
Paul
Rangel
Reichert

□ 0050

So the motion was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. While a celebration should be in order, I am disappointed the bill was considered on suspension, preventing amendments to improve the program.

The bill passed by this Chamber fails to correct a glaring mental health parity issue, which prevents the inclusion of children's psychiatric teaching hospitals in this program. Because these hospitals are classified by Medicare as psychiatric hospitals rather than as children's hospitals, they are ineligible for entry into the program.

In order to fix this oversight and to address the acute need for additional health care providers trained in child psychiatry, I introduced legislation, H.R. 2558, the Children's Hospitals Education Equity Act, which would include certain children's psychiatric hospitals in the definition to determine eligibility.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to correct this inequity and to advance our Nation another step closer to achieving full mental health parity.

GREGORY K. FRITZ: PARITY FOR KIDS' MENTAL HEALTH

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 30, 2011]
(By Gregory K. Fritz)

Despite the passage of the federal mental-health parity bill, stigma and prejudice are still alive and well when it comes to legislation affecting children's psychiatric hospitals. The latest example of how our government continues to maintain discriminatory funding policies specifically directed against children with mental-health issues involves federal support for graduate medical education (GME).

Although this issue is far overshadowed by the federal debt issue, those who care about the mental health of children need to be aware that achieving true parity still entails overcoming significant obstacles. Getting children's psychiatric hospitals recognized as legitimate sites of medical education is one such obstacle on the road to real parity that has both symbolic and pragmatic importance.

The history of federal support for training physicians during their hospital residencies goes back to the establishment of Medicare, in 1965. Recognizing that America needs a steady supply of physicians in all the areas of medicine, and that their training carries substantial additional expense for teaching hospitals, Medicare authorization includes a per-resident reimbursement that is provided to hospitals through a complicated formula. One element for determining GME payments is the percentage of a hospital's reimbursement that comes from Medicare. That children's hospitals would thus be excluded from the program (because Medicare pays virtually zero for children's medical care) was

unintentional, but it took 34 years for this oversight to be corrected.

The Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Payment Program (CHGME), in 1999, established a pool to provide residency education support to children's hospitals in a system modeled after the Medicare GME system. The unintentional disincentive to train pediatric generalists and specialists was removed and pediatric training accelerated dramatically. This year, a total of \$317.5 million offsets the training expenses of 5,500 residents at 46 children's hospitals, and the CHGME program is widely considered a success.

Parallel to the initial oversight in the Medicare bill, in the arcane definition of a children's hospital detailed in the CHGME regulations is language making it impossible for children's psychiatric hospitals to qualify. Only the most cynical observer would conclude that this was a deliberate attempt to exclude children's psychiatric hospitals and the child psychiatric and pediatric residents they train, especially since no medical specialty represents a greater shortage area than child and adolescent psychiatry. Yet, steady efforts since 2002 to correct this oversight have thus far been unsuccessful.

The CHGME reauthorization needed for the program to continue would seem to offer the ideal opportunity to end this de facto discrimination against children with mental-health problems. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse and Representatives David Cicilline and James Langevin, all Rhode Island Democrats, have offered similar versions of a brief amendment to the reauthorization that would correct the language to reflect the original bill's intent.

If passed, it would admit four or five children's psychiatric hospitals that meet strict criteria into the pool of hospitals eligible for CHGME reimbursement. A larger taxpayer outlay is not requested; rather, the existing money would be spread slightly more thinly (an estimated 30 additional residents would be added to the current 5,500). One would think it a small price to pay to correct an injustice, but passage is far from guaranteed.

As a child psychiatrist working at Bradley Hospital, one of the psychiatric hospitals that would finally be included, I'm far from dispassionate about this issue. I see every day the agony experienced by families with autism, childhood suicide, adolescent substance abuse or pediatric bipolar disorder; it's different, but no less severe, than the pain associated with juvenile diabetes or leukemia. As are all mental-health professionals, I'm troubled by the months-long waiting lists that prevent children's access to child psychiatric services.

The distinction between psychological and physiological disorders is artificial and antiquated, reflecting outdated fears and prejudices. In short, I see no valid reason to perpetuate the exclusion of children's psychiatric hospitals from the mechanism designed to support physicians' training. Neither do the thousands of members of 39 national organizations who have signed on to a letter urging support of the Whitehouse amendment. Mental-health parity is the law in principle; the CHGME reauthorization should make it be the case in practice.

Gregory K. Fritz, M.D., is academic director at Bradley Hospital and the editor of the Brown University Child and Adolescent Behavior Letter.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 633. An act to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, September 23, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3187. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Agricultural Swaps (RIN: 3038-AD21) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3188. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Dairy Promotion and Research Program; Final Rule on Amendments to the Order [Docket No.: DA-08-07; AMS-DA-08-0050] (RIN: 0581-AC87) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3189. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modifications of the Rules and Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0024; FV11-946-3 FIR] received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3190. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset Review (2011) [Document Number: AMS-TM-07-0136; TM-07-14FR] (RIN: 0581-AC77) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3191. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0015; FR] (RIN: 0581-AD03) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act,

Navy Case Number 07-10; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3193. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3194. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Kazakhstan pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3195. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving the Boeing Company, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3196. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3197. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3198. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3199. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3200. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Ireland pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3201. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-33, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3202. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3203. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3204. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Year 2011 Inventory of Commercial Activities, as required by the Federal Activities Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3205. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures,

and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30796; Amdt. No. 3437] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3206. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aviation Fuel and Oil Operating Limitations; Policy Memorandum [ANE-2010-33.7-5A] received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3207. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Nephi, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0184; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-4] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3208. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30795; Amdt. No. 3436] received August 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3209. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Alturas, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0403; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-3] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3210. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kayenta, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0393; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-2] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3211. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Fort Huachuca, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0359; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-1] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3212. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Glasgow, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0362; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-7] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3213. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lakeland, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0005; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-42] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3214. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Forsyth, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0516; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-12] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3215. A letter from the Commission, Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, transmitting the Commission's Final Report, "Transforming Wartime Contracting: Controlling costs, reducing risks"; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

3216. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority, pursuant to Public Law 111-117, section 7040(d); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. Supplemental report on House Resolution 409. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 112-214, Pt. 2).

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 412. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-215). 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. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to children in cases in which the confidentiality of the number has been compromised by reason of theft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to require that any new national wildlife refuge may not be established except as expressly authorized by statute; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself,

Mr. COBLE, and Mr. PETERSON):
H.R. 3010. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself,

Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. BROOKS):

H.R. 3011. A bill to authorize the programs of the Transportation Security Administration relating to the provision of transportation security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and

Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3013. A bill to prohibit assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 3014. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies and institutions of higher education to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3015. A bill to improve and enhance research and programs on childhood cancer survivorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3016. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly operate the Federal Recovery Coordination Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. BERMAN (for himself, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 3017. A bill to provide for a more structured and stable domestic agricultural labor market in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary surtax on increases in retained earnings of domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3019. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to consider certain factors in evaluating public transportation projects for purposes of making capital investment grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain Puerto Rico corporations to elect to be treated as domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify cost-sharing requirements under certain public transportation grant programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3022. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow urbanized area formula grants for public transportation projects to be used for operating costs in urbanized areas with a population of at least 200,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3023. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish the national pro-

gram for arts and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Ms. HOCHUL):

H.R. 3024. A bill to create a special class of H-2A workers who may be admitted to work as sheepherders or dairy workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. TURNER of New York):

H.R. 3025. A bill to provide for certain tunnel life safety and rehabilitation projects for Amtrak; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 3026. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety of drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 3027. A bill to end the use of corporal punishment in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit the transfer of sick leave in leave-transfer programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 3029. A bill to reduce the size of the Federal workforce through attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3030. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3031. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Newtown Battlefield located in Chemung County, New York, and the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3032. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment for services of qualified radiologist assistants under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REYES (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3033. A bill to amend the Anti-Smuggling Act to subject vehicles, other conveyances, and instruments of international traffic to seizure and forfeiture for smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 3034. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a San Francisco Bay restoration grant program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3035. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit informational calls to mobile telephone numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3036. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to award grants to prepare individuals for the 21st century workplace and to increase America's global competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3037. A bill to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H. Con. Res. 81. A concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 2608; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 24, 2011, as "Worldwide Day of Play"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 411. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED:

H. Res. 413. A resolution honoring Alfred University on the 175th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 414. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should incorporate the principles of the Lean Six Sigma management strategy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3008.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, related to providing for the general welfare. Additionally, it is enacted under the authority provided in Article I, Section 8 related to Congress' ability to "[carry] into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 3009.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3010.

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

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 3011.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defence of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides Congress the power to make "all laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out the constitutional powers vested in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 3012.

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

This law is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3013.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3014.

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

Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3015.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, the General Welfare clause

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3016.

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

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 3017.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause IV of the Constitution

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3018.

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

Article I, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, excises, to pay the debts and pro-

vide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3019.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the implied power to utilize collected taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3020.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to: (1) provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; (2) to lay and collect taxes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution; (3) to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and (4) to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory of the United States, as provided for under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3021.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the implied power to utilize collected taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3022.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the implied power to utilize collected taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 3023.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3024.

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

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

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3025.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 3026.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 3027.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3028.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 3029.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3030.

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

Art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 3 ("To regulate Commerce . . . among the several States", and cl. 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3031.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3032.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 3033.

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;

Clause 2: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Clause 4: To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

Clause 5: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

Clause 6: To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

Clause 8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

Clause 9: To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

Clause 10: To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

Clause 11: To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Clause 15: To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

Clause 16: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

Clause 17: To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3034.

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

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3035.

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

Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3036.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3037.

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

Article 1 Section 2

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 52: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 104: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 111: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 115: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 157: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 190: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 210: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 306: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 436: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 452: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 482: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 527: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 572: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 605: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 615: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 674: Mr. MICA and Mr. GARRETT.
 H.R. 683: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 687: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 688: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 719: Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 791: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 797: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 822: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 904: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 973: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 990: Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 991: Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BUSHON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 1063: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1092: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1137: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. OWENS and Ms. BUERKLE.
 H.R. 1259: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 1267: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1283: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1354: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 1385: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WEST, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1471: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1489: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1509: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DOLD, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 1681: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1697: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1704: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1715: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1717: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 1724: Mr. FARR and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1738: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1754: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1798: Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. HOCHUL.
 H.R. 1834: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1955: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1956: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1997: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 2059: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2091: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2097: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2131: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 2159: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 2195: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 2245: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2250: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 2257: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 2304: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 2307: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 2311: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 2312: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2334: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2357: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2369: Mr. MICA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. QUIGLEY Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PETRI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BERG, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
 H.R. 2377: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2447: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 2471: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. OLVER and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 2505: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2514: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 2517: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. BARTLETT.
 H.R. 2558: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2569: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 2602: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2674: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2681: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 2706: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 2758: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 2774: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 2796: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2815: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 2834: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. HECK, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 2854: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 2874: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 2885: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2888: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 2897: Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 2926: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 2955: Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 2962: Ms. BERKLEY.

- H.R. 2966: Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 2982: Mr. SHULER and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 2992: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 2993: Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 3003: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3004: Mr. BACA, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 3005: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.J. Res. 73: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
- H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. HURT.
- H. Res. 134: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H. Res. 239: Mr. PETERSON.
- H. Res. 247: Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H. Res. 336: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
- H. Res. 364: Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FLORES, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. CHU, and Ms. EDWARDS.
- H. Res. 378: Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H. Res. 394: Mr. HULTGREN.
- H. Res. 397: Mr. HINOJOSA.