



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2012

No. 18

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 6, 2012, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2012

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Cal LeMon, First and Calvary Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

God, as You know, these walls have echoed with Your name for centuries.

You see, God, we know Your name because we are Your Nation, Your people. To prove it, we've printed Your name on our dollar bills, chiseled Your name into our granite walls everywhere in this city, and regularly include Your name in prayers before Friday night high school football games.

Therefore, since You are our God, the Prince of Peace, I ask You to quell the need in this room to dominate, degrade, and even denigrate.

I ask You, God, the Healer, to rub the salve of Your Holy Spirit into our long-festering political wounds.

I ask You, God, the Creator, to whisper new words, new possibilities, and new solutions up and down these aisles.

Teach us, Lord, when we drop Your name, we must also be ready to drop to our knees again and again and learn from You how to be one nation under God, with liberty and justice for everyone.

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 Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANKFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND CAL LEMON

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges we have as Members of Congress is to have the leader of a church back home deliver the opening prayer for the United States House of Representatives.

Today, I am proud to introduce America to a friend of mine, the Reverend Doctor Cal LeMon. Reverend LeMon is an ordained elder at First and Calvary Presbyterian Church in Springfield, Missouri, where he regularly preaches and teaches in a historic house of worship.

He is the president of Executive Enrichment, Inc., a corporate education and consulting firm, assisting organizations to become more productive through effective leadership. He is also

a writer and regularly contributes to the Society for Human Resources magazine, Employment Relations Today, and the opinion page of USA Today.

Like many members of the clergy, the Reverend Cal LeMon is an important voice in our community. Reverend LeMon is and has been a tremendous spiritual influence on my family and me.

He has a heart for his country and for each and every one of us. I am honored to welcome him here to Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches from either side of the aisle.

NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 3, is the American Heart Association's National Wear Red Day, which encourages people to help raise awareness and join the fight against heart disease, which is the leading killer of women.

Now, I understand most men don't own a red suit unless, of course, you were keyboardist in an eighties hair band. But we all have shirts; we all have ties, accessories, and lapels by which we can show our support and "Go Red for Women."

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.

H443

As sons, husbands, fathers, and friends, we can do no less for the women we owe everything, for the women we love, for the women whose loss would empty our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage every American, Go Red.

HONORING 100 GREAT YEARS OF GIRL SCOUTS

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, Juliette "Daisy" Gordon Low organized the first Girl Scout troop in Savannah, Georgia. Daisy began with 18 girls in one troop in Savannah, but her movement has grown to include over 50 million American women over the past 100 years, including 3.2 million active members today.

The Girl Scouts build character by engaging girls in community service, developing leadership skills, and preparing girls to take their place in the world. I know what I'm talking about because I have a twin sister, and she was a Girl Scout.

I'm proud of the hard work of the girls and women who've been a part of the Girl Scouts movement, but I'm even more grateful for the positive influence this institution has had on millions of girls throughout America and the world.

So I congratulate the Girl Scouts on 100 great years, and I wish them every success for the next 100 years.

EMPLOYMENT AND DEBT

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Our newest national unemployment numbers are in, 8.3 percent. It's progress, but it's 37 months above 8 percent.

It makes me grateful again to be from Oklahoma. We have the 10th lowest unemployment rate in the country at around 6 percent. Forbes Magazine listed my district as one of the happiest places to work in the country.

Oklahoma is the number one place to start a small business and number one in technology job growth. In the last 8 years, Oklahoma City has created more than 80,000 new jobs. These jobs include a thriving energy, aviation, and biomedical center.

Oklahomans work with private businesses, nonprofits, churches and religious organizations to feed the hungry, help families get back on their feet after disasters, and offer job training and education.

On this mission, we don't see Washington as our enemy. Sometimes we don't see Washington as our ally. What so many people back home tell me they want from their Federal Government is a plan to reduce our debt, simplify our Tax Code, and get rid of the red tape

off their businesses. Then you'll really see our economy take off.

and make America open for business again.

LILLY LEDBETTER AND PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this week, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act was signed into law. Named after a true hero who was shortchanged by her employer for decades and who fought back all the way to the Supreme Court, the Lilly Ledbetter Act ensured that women who are discriminated against have the right to sue as long as their unequal pay continues.

This was a good first step, but we have to do more to achieve real pay equity in America. Today, women are still only paid 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men for the very same job. They lose out on between \$400,000 and \$2 million over a lifetime. This is an injustice.

It is time to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act already passed twice by this body. It would give real teeth to the Equal Pay Act. It has been almost 50 years since Congress passed the Equal Pay Act. It is time to ensure that one-half of America's workforce is paid as fairly as the other half.

□ 0910

MAKING AMERICA OPEN FOR BUSINESS

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

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to go red today and to honor our Girl Scouts.

We have a wonderful woman in our beautiful Hudson Valley, Martha, who is from Wappingers Falls and who is a former computer programmer and a current substitute teacher. She wrote to me: It broke my heart to hear that Kodak filed for bankruptcy. What is being done to keep the companies that are producing made in the U.S.A. products here in the United States?

Martha, that's a great question. And here's what we can do and what we're doing in the House of Representatives. We're working to make our Tax Code flatter and fairer. We're working to remove burdensome and unnecessary regulations. And we're working to take less from hardworking Americans like you so that we can spend and save and invest right here in our communities and in our country. We've sent 30 bills to the Senate, 27 of which still sit unanswered.

So this week in the House of Representatives, we're working further to shrink the Federal Government and to make our budget process have common sense the way you do in your own homes. I urge the Senate to join us to work together to revive our economy

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in complete disgust of the Republican conferees' attempt to include an education requirement as a condition of receiving unemployment benefits.

To require people who would otherwise be eligible for benefits to now either have a high school diploma or be enrolled in a GED program is discriminatory. It is despicable.

Adding conditions to receiving compensation does nothing to create jobs or address the real causes of unemployment. It is a difficult time, Mr. Speaker, to be unemployed in America, but Republicans seem determined to make it even more difficult by kicking the unemployed while they're down.

With less than a month to craft a long-term tax measure, I urge Republican conferees to stop obstructing the process by insisting on distracting proposals that are only meant to score political points.

I am opposed to any education requirement to receive unemployment benefits. I implore my colleagues to do the same.

LET GULF COAST GET BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. CASSIDY. "The gulf oil spill has been terrible for the Gulf Coast. But as bad as it has been, the Federal Government's moratorium on deepwater drilling can be worse."

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago I had the honor to speak these words while offering a motion to immediately end President Obama's moratorium on deepwater drilling.

Although the moratorium has officially ended, there is still a two-thirds cut in new permitting and an overall slowdown in production that has caused nearly one-half of the Gulf Coast's oil and gas-focused businesses to reduce wages or lay off workers.

These aren't the major oil and gas companies. These are small businesses that cannot move overseas. Forty-one percent are not turning a profit. Seventy percent have had to draw from their savings accounts to meet operating expenses. The gulf oil spill is a tragedy, but for workers, the moratorium has made it worse.

For the sake of job creation, affordable domestic energy, and a stronger economy for all Americans, I call on the President to reverse these policies and let the Gulf Coast get back to work.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS DOWN

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the reports have just come out a few minutes ago, and it's great news for America: 243,000 jobs were created in January, which is 150,000 more than were expected. The unemployment rate is down to 8.3 percent from 8.5 percent. So the programs are working. I congratulate President Obama, and urge my Republican colleagues to pass a jobs bill so we can continue to have a downslide on unemployment.

Now, I know Mitt Romney says he's not concerned about the very poor, but this is good news for all Americans, from the very poor to the middle class.

This Congress needs to work together with the President to pass a jobs bill and to make sure that unemployment keeps going down. This is great news for all America, great news for President Obama, and great news for all of us.

CBO REVEALS PRESIDENT'S
FAILED POLICIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, throughout his campaign for the White House, the President made an empty promise to cut our deficit in half by the end of his first term. Earlier this week, the Congressional Budget Office announced its projection that the President's failed policies, sadly, have more than doubled the annual debt. Our debt has increased by almost \$5 trillion over the last 3 years. This statistic shows that throughout the Presidency of the current President, the President has recklessly spent the tax dollars of hardworking American families.

The Wall Street Journal stated: "To sum it all up, the CBO's facts plainly show that Mr. Obama has the worst fiscal record of any President in modern times. No one else even comes close." At a time when Americans are searching for jobs, the President must follow through with this promise to the American people and work with both Houses of Congress to stop Washington's out-of-control borrowing and spending.

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

HONORING CENTENNIAL OF GIRL
SCOUTS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor the cen-

tennial of our Nation's Girl Scouts. For 100 years, the Girl Scout experience has enriched the lives of millions of girls and their families through innovative and progressive programming that embraces the rich diversity of communities across our country. A cornerstone of the Girl Scout movement, community service, allows girls to exercise their leadership skills on a variety of levels and at any age.

Each year, thousands of service hours are provided to communities. Cleaning parks, organizing food and toy drives, planting trees and clearing forest trails, tutoring young students in migrant camp summer schools, collecting basic essentials and backpacks for children entering foster care, sending school supplies to Third World schools, visiting the elderly, and helping deliver food to homebound citizens are just a few of the important activities that Girl Scouts do every day to make the world, our world, a better place. That is something from which each of us can and should learn.

I would like to personally honor the Girl Scouts of northeastern New York, which serves 12,000 girls and their families in a 15-county region. I look forward to dozens of these girls coming to visit Washington, D.C., in early June, where they will join others in song along the National Mall.

From their individual efforts to hosting the Women of Distinction Award, thank you to our Girl Scouts and their leaders, and a very happy and healthy centennial celebration.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 658,
FAA REAUTHORIZATION AND RE-
FORM ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

□ 0920

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

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I

may consume. During the consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 533 provides for a standard rule for consideration of the conference report for H.R. 658, the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, the United States aviation industry currently accounts for nearly 11 million jobs and contributes \$1.3 trillion to the Nation's gross domestic product.

Regrettably, since September 30, 2007, the FAA has operated under a series of short-term, stopgap extensions. In fact, there have been 23 extensions of the FAA programs since the last multiyear reauthorization was signed into law 8 years ago. I'm relieved that we have finally stopped playing politics with the safety of our airline passengers and appear to be on the verge of passing a necessary, meaningful, and long-term FAA reauthorization.

The FAA conference report provides responsible funding for FAA safety programs, air traffic control modernization efforts, known as NextGen, and operations through 2015. It holds spending at fiscal year 2011 levels while providing \$13.4 billion in projects that will create much needed construction jobs. The conference report contains no earmarks, and it does not raise taxes or passenger facility charges during this difficult economic time.

With the passage of the reauthorization, the deployment of NextGen technologies to replace our current, outdated, ground-based air traffic control system will begin. NextGen will bring an estimated net \$281 billion benefit to the overall U.S. economy through decreased flight delays, decreased fuel use, and job opportunities for new, high-tech companies.

The House-Senate agreement will also improve aviation safety for passengers, reform antiquated programs that have become overly reliant on government subsidies, and establish a process to address outdated and obsolete air traffic control facilities, thereby saving taxpayer dollars.

Because we are finally passing a 4-year authorization, the conference report will provide long-term certainty for the aviation industry and all who rely upon it. This certainty will produce an environment which allows for the creation of high-paying and sustainable jobs. Instead of wondering whether or not the next extension will squeeze by just before the expiration, employees and job creators can budget,

plan, and grow with confidence that government will not pull the rug out from under them.

While I'm excited that we have finally embraced the benefits of certainty and stability when it comes to our aviation system, I can't help but state what many Americans probably feel is obvious: This is how the system is supposed to work.

Far too often, Congress jumps from crisis to crisis, many of which appear to this freshman Member to be self-created. Far too often, because of the unwillingness of some to cooperate, we have been forced to wait until we're up against some kind of deadline that if we don't act, something else looms on the other side. This is no way to legislate, and it's no way to govern. It certainly isn't the legislative process I learned in my 7th grade civics class. Instead, we should be striving to do our work as the Founding Fathers envisioned. They understood and anticipated that the House of Representatives and the Senate would not always walk in lockstep agreement on every issue.

On the second day of the first Congress, on April 7, 1789, there was a conference committee appointed by the House and Senate, and they worked out their differences. Since that time, the House and Senate have formulated positions, each of which may be somewhat different, and yet conferees would be appointed to manage that Chamber's position and to hash out differences and produce an agreement that both Chambers could agree on.

In my first year in Washington, however, it seemed that is the exception much more than the rule. Much more often, one side takes a position, and then on the other side they refuse to do the same, and there's a lack of any kind of compromise or cooperation. I'm not interested in assigning any blame on whom or why that has taken place or why the process is the way it is. I do believe, though, that cooperation takes a willing partner, and we can be that willing partner.

Today is a good day, but we have so much more work to do. Even though the process is not a headline-getting opportunity, the process is important. To me, the more we can push down the pyramid of power and spread out the base and let every Member be a player, we'll have a process that both the House and the Senate can work on and work with each other on and cooperate and the better the policy will be. If the process is broken, sure enough, the product is broken. If the process is good, as this process has been, then I guarantee you, the unintended consequences that usually appear in bills that are pushed through in the dark of night are done away with. And we have an opportunity to do that today. So no one got everything they wanted, and yet this is a picture of how it ought to be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation,

and encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on both of those measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I want to thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the customary time of 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after 23 short-term extensions, I am glad that we have finally brought the long-term FAA authorization bill to the floor. Twenty-three extensions are about 20 too long. Unfortunately, this legislation also contains unnecessary language that would inject politics into what should otherwise be a clean bill to make our skies safer.

Today's bill would change requirements for unionization that have existed for more than 75 years. This politically driven legislation is being done unilaterally without consulting unions and the workers whom it will impact.

During the 20th century, the rise of unions was quickly followed by the creation of the American middle class—the largest middle class on Earth; and thanks to their safety protections, fair pay and humane hours that were achieved by unionized labor for all the rest of us who labor, the American workers didn't just hear about the American Dream—they lived it. Meanwhile, American corporations, including airlines, were rewarded with the best workers that the world had to offer.

Over the years, a changing global economy and a deliberate effort to weaken unions has made life harder and harder for the middle class. In the aviation industry, airlines began to outsource repairs, often using counterfeit parts and even repairing airplanes in foreign countries, endangering our flying public. The unions fought these changes and tried to keep American workers in charge of protecting the American flying public; but over the objections of the unions, the airlines continued to outsource, sometimes resulting in very dangerous accidents.

Today, it's more challenging than ever for a middle class family to pay rising medical bills, to put food on the table, and to afford a college education for the next generation. For so many families, the American Dream has now become nothing more than a memory of times past.

At a time when some of our Nation's airlines are reporting record profits and our Nation's workers are struggling to get by, I don't think we should be considering legislation that makes it harder for the middle class to survive. In State capitals and in the Halls of Congress, the American worker has been under a sustained political attack. These attacks must not go undefended. For that reason, I cannot support this bill and ask for a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my good friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER from New York, and I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the bill.

I will continue to oppose all FAA reauthorizations because I strongly oppose the FAA's New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia airspace redesign plan, which includes the rerouting of at least 100 additional flights over Rockland County, the district which I represent.

□ 0930

While this bill will likely pass, I will not stop insisting that the FAA revise their ill-advised redesign plan for the airspace around New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

I have spoken to and written letters to the FAA and to Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood asking for the reconsideration of their redesign plan. I continue to be outraged at the decision to direct even more flights over my district. Talk about government arrogance. Talk about not even caring about the people they affect. Talk about not even having any kind of hearings within the affected areas, trying to sneak it through. Talk about having the person who approves it, overseeing the plan, is the original one who drew it. So he has a stake in it, and of course he's going to approve it. There are a number of alternatives to address flight delays without requiring the people of Rockland to bear the burden.

As my constituents have noted to me, the noise and air pollution in the area will increase. It is unknown how this increase in air pollution will affect the disproportionate rate of childhood asthma in my district. I believe it's clear that this airspace redesign will result in a decline in the quality of life for my constituents in suburban Rockland County. And what for? The expected result of this ill-advised plan is a paltry reduction of delays—an average of only 3 minutes per flight. That's not good enough for the inconvenience it's going to cause my constituents.

The modernization of our aviation system is necessary to bring it into the 21st century, to keep pace with the increased number of flights and to also maintain our technological advancements by implementing new equipment to keep our system the safest in the world. While NextGen is important to upgrading our aviation system, it should not be exempt from environmental studies, which this bill makes it. I object to the provisions in this bill that grant such an exemption.

And, finally, I want to echo the words of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). I am also strongly opposed to the changes the bill makes to the National Mediation Board. While the middle class is suffering in this country, we should not be making it harder for workers to exercise their

right to engage in collective bargaining. Unions are essential to improving the middle class and strengthening the wages and benefits of our workers.

So I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA halts and revises their deeply flawed airspace redesign plan. And I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against the bill.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to let the House know and the Speaker know that this conference report was signed by all the Republicans and Democrats. There are a few people against this, but not many. It's a bipartisan effort. All the Democrats in the Senate signed the conference report. So I believe this is a great bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for her courtesies of extending time on a bill that we have been waiting for for a very long time. I was speaking, as I was coming to the floor, and thinking about whether or not we could work together in a bipartisan manner.

I represent a number of airports generally, and specifically I represent Bush Intercontinental Airport, which has a reputation for being one of the top airports around the Nation. A couple of months ago, we stood together with our airport director and workers in the community, asking for an FAA authorization bill.

We are in need of repairs, and we are in need of growth. And how exciting it is to know that this has been one of the best job-growth months in our time, 243,000 jobs. We're on the right track, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and this bill would have certainly been on the right track.

But why in the world do we put in this bill a poison pill that some say is a settlement, a resolve, that takes a configuration of counting that is absurd? For those who want to come together as the First Amendment allows you to do, the right to assemble in unions and employee organizations—which to date has not harmed our airport industry—for those who want to come together, an absurd configuration of retirees and people who are not there are counted when you have an election to become a union.

Just yesterday, the Governor of Indianapolis, Indiana, signed a right-to-work. We have right-to-work States. We have recognized their existence. Whether we like them or not, they exist. Why can't unions have the right in a fair way to organize?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady for her kindness.

If any Member, any Governor had to go to the polls and work to bring peo-

ple to the polls to vote in an election in a democratic process and in that election they had to count the people who were home, asleep in their beds, some who did not desire to vote—that was their democratic choice, although we want everyone to vote—most people would say that is absurd, including my friends on the other side of the aisle. Why did this have to be the scourge in this particular legislation?

Let me also say that, as the ranking member on the Transportation Security Committee and as formerly the chairperson, I believe in working together. We had a pilot program dealing with privatization in some small airports of the Transportation Security Administration. But the gentlelady is from New York. And if I recall, we were privatized on that fateful date of 9/11. The idea is to make our TSOs at a level that is responsible across the Nation. And we had language in this bill that said that we may look at other requests or make decisions on other requests for using privatization. No, they go and change the language.

Now, "the Secretary shall." She has to. And there is no credible evidence that suggests that the privatization of TSOs or the Transportation Security Administration is going to make our Nation safer. Why do we mix infrastructure work—getting our airports safer and credible and ready to expand—with these kinds of poison pills in the box, in-your-eye initiatives?

So, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to say that I am shouting for the fact that we have finally come together in what could be a way forward; but, unfortunately, we have decided to use the poison pen strategy, divide but not conquer. We're going to fix this as we go forward.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I would like to inform my colleague I am ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Very briefly, in closing, politically driven additions to today's legislation mar what would have otherwise been a clean and commendable funding bill for the FAA, and I deeply regret it. I regret that some have opted to take this important legislation and inject politics where it does not belong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we're finally getting ready to provide certainty and stability to our aviation industry and to those who depend on it for their livelihoods and safe travel.

The agreement reached between the House and Senate conferees is far from perfect, and I doubt everyone got everything they wanted. But it promises to improve air travel for passengers, comfort and safety, while ensuring a more modern air traffic control system. It keeps spending flat, and it's

free of earmarks, tax increases, or any increase in passenger facility charges. It provides funding for airport infrastructure projects that will spur much needed construction jobs for an industry that has been hit particularly hard by the economic downturn.

This conference report represents a step in the right direction. While long overdue, in this instance, the legislative process has finally worked, and Congress stands ready to work the people's will.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of the rule and its passage along with the underlying bill and its passage.

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

□ 0940

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 533, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 1, 2012, at page H230.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 658.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report for the FAA reauthorization. This is the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2012.

First, I want to take a moment to thank Ranking Member RAHALL, Chairman PETRI, Ranking Member COSTELLO, as well as Chairman ROCKEFELLER, Ranking Member HUTCHISON, and the conferees who worked on this conference report and the underlying bill so that we could reach an agreement on this conference report and this

bipartisan bill. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the Science, Space, and Technology Committee chairman, who is with us this morning, as well as Ranking Member LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee, for their assistance, and I want to thank other committees in Congress that have played important parts and have provided assistance to our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to get this bill done.

I must also thank the staff. If I look a little bedraggled this morning, our staff is probably even more bedraggled. Almost all of the members of the T&I Committee stayed through a markup that ended at 2:49 a.m. this morning, and they are here bright and chipper this morning. I appreciate all of the staff. I want to particularly thank Holly Woodruff Lyons, who is our staff director on the FAA subcommittee; Mr. Jim Coon, our staff director of the full committee; Amy Steinmann Smith, who is our policy director; Bailey Edwards; and Suzanne Mullen.

I also have to give a special thanks to our legal counsel, who last night informed me she is resigning today. That was at about 2 a.m. in the morning, but it was with good plans for her, her family and her future. She has served the committee well. We'll miss her. It wasn't as a result of staying up all night and working on this bill, but I'm sure that provided some incentive.

People don't understand how our staff works. On this measure, our staff worked over the holidays—and I'm talking about through Christmas last year and the New Year's holiday. They worked on weekends, and they worked late into the night, not unlike many Americans. They did this for many Americans who want to work, and that's what this legislation is about.

This legislation deals with our entire American aviation industry. It sets all of the policy, all of the formulas. All of the major projects are outlined. This is the blueprint for the United States of America and, actually, for anywhere between 8 and 11 percent of our entire economic activity.

Aviation, we take for granted, but two-thirds of all the people who fly in the world fly in the United States. Aviation has provided a magic carpet where today, these Members are here, Mr. Speaker, and in a few hours or several flights later, they'll be home—across the continent, to the far reaches of the United States and our territories. That's the magic it provides us. It's the engine that drives business and the economy for the United States, and this Congress failed to provide a reauthorization.

I have only been the chair of this committee for a year now. I had the good fortune of being the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation in 2001, and we wrote the last authorization, a 4-year bill, in 2003 that expired in 2007 when the other side of the aisle had control. For 4 years, they had control of the House and the Senate, and for 2

years, they had total control—House, Senate, White House.

□ 0950

They could not pass a bill, a blueprint for the aviation industry. They passed 17 extensions, and the former FAA Administrator said it's causing havoc. These extensions cost the taxpayer millions of dollars, and you can't run an agency that's responsible for so much of our economy with these hiccup extensions.

Now, we've done a total of 23, probably more extensions in the history of any other legislation that's come before this Congress for authorization of an activity within the government. Twenty-three. Seventeen. I had to do six.

I got a little testy, I got tough, but I said, enough is enough. I was tough, and I think I did get people to come to their senses and say that this isn't a Republican or a Democrat issue. This isn't a labor a business issue. This is an issue about putting people to work and defining Federal policy for one of the most important aspects of our economy. So although it's tough, I intend to be tough.

Last night, we stayed till 3 o'clock in the morning. We'll stay as long as it takes to get these measures done that are so important to drive the economic engine of America. With the transportation legislation last night, there were historic reforms, and we took 90 amendments, I believe, from the other side, in a very open process, and everyone had an opportunity to participate and vote on this FAA authorization and in the historic legislation that we passed at 2:49 a.m. this morning. So no one has been denied the opportunity to participate.

It's amazing, when you come together, what you can get done, and the American people want that. They're tired of the bickering and they're tired of the fighting. Yes, we may have some heated discussions—yes, we may have differences of opinion—but we got the job done. So today is an historic day on two counts with two major accomplishments to pass a transportation bill, working, again, with Members, and I appreciate their work.

Today, this historic conference report finally sets a blueprint for aviation industry and an important aspect of our economy. This sets the policy for also taking us into the next generation of air travel. It's called NextGen, next generation air traffic control, so our planes can fly safer in the skies, so we have the ability to save fuel, so that we can get from point to point and know where those aircraft are both in the air and on the ground. This legislation sets that blueprint.

So I am very pleased to be here. I am pleased for the American people because the Congress has done its work. They don't want excuses. They want results. And today is a day of results for one of the longest-term extended authorizations in the history of the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to document for the RECORD a clerical error in the message to the Senate regarding the House appointment of conferees on H.R. 658. On January 31, 2012, the Speaker appointed members of the Ways and Means committee to serve as conferees on, among other provisions, title VIII of the Senate amendment. The Journal, the House Calendar and the signature sheets on the conference report accurately depict this appointment. However, the message to the Senate provided that the appointment was for title VII of the Senate amendment. I want to assure Members that the House conferees acted in accordance with the Speaker's appointment.

With those few remarks—and I will have additional—I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I had hoped for legislation today that would be laser-focused on creating jobs, on creating jobs and making our aviation system safer, more efficient and more accessible for our flying public. Instead, much of the drama over the FAA reauthorization, for the last year—and there's been plenty of that drama—erupted over a provision of the House-passed bill that would have changed how the National Mediation Board, the NMB, counts votes in representation elections at airlines and railroads.

Now, let me be clear. As I stated in our perfunctory one single, only conference meeting on this issue, that provision had no place and these labor provisions before the National Mediation Board have no place in FAA reauthorization because it has nothing to do with improving safety or creating jobs. Instead, it was a salvo aimed by the majority in this House at our American workers.

Today, we have a conference report with a so-called compromise, but that compromise still changes how airline and railroad workers join unions. Now, some will say that this compromise is several degrees better than the original provision in the House bill. Nevertheless, I strongly oppose the inclusion of this NMB provision in the pending legislation.

On the other hand, I am pleased that the conference committee flat-out rejected the proposal of the original House-passed bill to sunset the Essential Air Service program. I was beginning to suspect that my Republican colleagues were confusing the EAS title of this bill with the ESA, which, in my mind, refers to the Endangered Species Act. The gentleman in the chair will know to which I refer.

But this conference report will not make EAS an endangered species, fortunately, and the program will be continued with modest reforms to ensure that it remains a worthy investment. For communities in my home State of West Virginia, these airports are a vital lifeline and engine of economic growth that will be preserved, and this is what I reference when I refer to creating jobs.

This legislation will improve safety, and it will improve efficiency. It will create some jobs, though not enough, in my view. While it does not slash FAA funding to 2008 levels, it could have authorized more investment in our Nation's aviation infrastructure.

On the journey to a 100 percent sustainable, efficient, accessible, and safe aviation system, this bill is just a way-point. Much more work is still ahead, but at least this legislation will set a course for the Federal Aviation Administration to follow in investing for the future and in keeping the skies safe in the coming years.

I do not want to see the FAA continue to limp along in the no-man's land of serial extensions, to which the chairman has already referred—23 or 24 to this date—and I certainly do not want to see another shutdown of this agency, as we saw last August, with innocent individuals being laid off work.

But I will watch closely how the NMB provision affects workers' bargaining rights, and will be ready to act to correct any unfair imbalance if that becomes necessary.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICA. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding. As are you and our other colleagues, I am happy to see this process coming to a conclusion.

The successful conference report that we're debating today demonstrates our ability to take on important issues and still reach bicameral, bipartisan agreement on how to move our aviation industry forward, reform a critical government agency, and create jobs.

This legislation will, at long last, provide stable funding and policy direction for the FAA's safety programs, airport development grants, NextGen efforts, and operations for budget years 2012–2015. The legislation contains no earmarks and achieves savings for our taxpayers.

This legislation includes many important aviation-policy initiatives. I'm especially pleased with the reforms included in the legislation for the FAA's NextGen program. The conference report establishes timelines, performance metrics, and accountability for the NextGen program.

□ 1000

The conference agreement also authorizes the FAA to streamline environmental reviews that often stall out efforts to increase the efficiency of our national airspace system. To be clear, the benefits of the NextGen program are not only felt by aviation users. A May 2011 Deloitte study showed a \$281 billion net benefit to the U.S. economy if the NextGen program is implemented on time. So I'm pleased to move this legislation that will help the

FAA's efforts to implement the important NextGen modernization program.

By setting requirements and deadlines for FAA rules for the safe integration of unmanned aircraft systems, the conference report also unlocks the potential for private sector job creation here at home that has so far been stalled by government inaction.

Along with advancements in the NextGen program, this legislation enacts policies that will foster sustained, long-term job creation in our private sector, reaffirming the United States' leadership role in aerospace innovation and manufacturing.

In addition to policy changes that help spur job creation, the legislation makes over \$14 billion available for airport projects over the life of the bill. As the spring construction season nears, it's important to have the stable funding available for airport projects. This legislation gives airport managers the ability to plan and execute airport projects that will support thousands of construction jobs. This legislation also enacts protections to assure airline passengers are treated properly and fairly in the event of travel delays.

The bill makes reforms to the Essential Air Service program, eliminating Federal subsidies in the most egregious circumstances, as highlighted last year.

Overall, the reforms included in the legislation will make the FAA work smarter, reduce its footprint, and deliver more.

The final product will provide the kind of stability and job creation for America's aviation infrastructure that this Congress and the American people have been looking for.

I strongly support this legislation, and before concluding would like to acknowledge the very hard work of Holly Lyons and our general counsel, Bailey Edwards, as well as Giles Giovinazzi and Alex Burkett, who have helped negotiate with the Senate and bring this project to a successful conclusion.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I am very honored, in a nostalgic way, to recognize the gentleman from Illinois, the former chairman of our subcommittee on aviation, the current ranking member, who is taking his expertise—and hopefully not his friendship—and going elsewhere after this year. He has been a very valued member of our committee, and his treasure chest of knowledge on this issue is boundless. I am just so happy and thankful that we've had JERRY COSTELLO to represent us on this issue for so many years.

I recognize him for as much time as he wants.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. RAHALL. Let me thank him not only for his friendship and his kind words but for his leadership on the committee on so many issues.

As the chairman pointed out, we were in a markup until almost 3 a.m. this morning, and Mr. RAHALL led us

on our side of the aisle in working together to try and come up with a better product than was presented to us last night. So I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to say from the outset that I'm deeply disappointed in the change to the Railway Labor Act that was added to the conference report during final negotiations on the National Mediation Board provision between Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader REID. The NMB language had been dropped altogether, as Mr. RAHALL indicated in his statement. Congress should not be amending the Railway Labor Act in this bill. Importantly, there are several provisions in the conference report that help organized labor, and after working on this legislation for over 5 years, I believe it's necessary to move forward and enact a multiyear reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

However, I want to be clear: I join the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, and many others, that if the Railway Labor Act change proves to have a significant impact—negative impact—on the right to organize, we must come back and revisit this issue.

One of my highest priorities in the FAA reauthorization bill has been and is fair bargaining rights for employees at the FAA. After leading the fight for many years, I am pleased that the conference report establishes a process for mediation and binding arbitration of impasses between the FAA and its unions.

As Chairman PETRI indicated, the FAA Modernization and Reform Act provides \$63 billion dollars for FAA infrastructure programs, operations, and research over the 4-year period of the bill. I wanted to see higher funding levels and a passenger facility charge increase for job-creating airport infrastructure projects. However, the funding levels in this conference report are an improvement over the 2008 levels originally proposed in the House-passed bill. They are roughly level with the current year's appropriation.

The conference report also includes a number of safety provisions in the FAA reauthorization bill that we had in previous Congresses, such as a stronger requirement for maintenance work performed on U.S. commercial airlines by outside contractors. It also requires the FAA to assess the appropriate staff levels for air traffic controllers, FAA managers, and aviation safety inspectors.

In addition, the conference report takes important steps to advance the next generation air traffic control system that is desperately needed not only by the industry and for the flying public but by the country as a whole. We create a new chief NextGen officer who will serve as the primary point of contact for NextGen implementation at the FAA to provide accountability and stability, and require reporting metrics to ensure that NextGen is making progress.

Further, it would require the FAA to work closely with affected unions in the planning, development, and deployment of NextGen. I wrote this provision in the bill 4 years ago, and I'm glad to see that it will be enacted into law in this conference report.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, despite the flaws that we talked about in the bill, we desperately need a long-term FAA reauthorization bill, and that's why I'm supporting this bill.

I thank the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, Chairman MICA, Chairman PETRI, and other committee members for all of their hard work on this legislation, and I thank the staff on both sides of the aisle, who have worked very hard over the past 5 years to try and bring us to the point where we are today to get a bill on the President's desk.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself 15 seconds to say how much Pat Mica and I have enjoyed our relationship with JERRY COSTELLO and his wife, Georgia. People don't know a lot about Congress and how many friends there are across the aisle and how we can be privileged to have somebody like JERRY COSTELLO, both to chair an aviation subcommittee and to be a ranking member, a key player.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, one of the conferees, and a senior member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. SHUSTER. I rise today in support of the conference report for the FAA Modernization Reform Act of 2012. This is a very good bipartisan, bicameral conference report.

I want to congratulate Chairman MICA, Ranking Member RAHALL, Chairman PETRI, and a special congratulations and thanks to Ranking Member COSTELLO for years of service here. It's been a pleasure serving with you, and I wish you the best as you ride off into the sunset, but I'm sure you'll be doing great things in the future. So, again, thanks for all your hard work in your years here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Modernization and Reform Act does not raise taxes or passenger facility charges. It holds spending levels through 2015 at \$63 billion over the 4 years, and it does not add to the deficit, which I'm very pleased to see.

It provides long-term stability for the FAA and the aviation industry, which is a certainty in that transportation sector that has sorely been missing in the economy. So we believe it's going to create and sustain good-paying jobs.

It accelerates and requires accountability for the deployment of NextGen, the FAA's air traffic control modernization program, which we need in order to be able to more efficiently manage the skies above us.

□ 1010

It provides for unprecedented reforms of the National Mediation Board.

While I'm disappointed that we were unable to include the European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme prohibition language, we will continue to pursue the passage of that bill. I think it's something we really need to focus on here in Congress before the taxes are starting to be collected and do great damage and harm to our aviation and airline industry.

This is a responsible and much-needed conference report. Therefore, I urge all Members to vote to pass the conference report for the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a member of the conference committee as well.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was named conferee. I have been on the aviation committee for 26 years. There was no legislative conference.

The most contentious provision of the bill was a deal that was struck between HARRY REID, the majority leader of the Senate, and Speaker BOEHNER; and it was a take-it-or-leave-it deal.

Now, this bill is absolutely critical to the safety and security of the aviation system of the United States of America. It's critical for its modernization. It's critical for its competitiveness. These things are extraordinarily important to our country. Aviation constitutes, in aggregate, about 10 or 11 percent of our gross domestic product. It is not a sector that we can continue to ignore and underfund in terms of providing it with the tools it needs to be more fuel efficient and safer for the traveling public and more efficient for business transport and goods.

But those things should not be held hostage to the incredible anti-labor bias of the majority here in the House. The bill that passed our committee would have established a rule for the formation of a union that said anybody who was eligible to vote, who didn't vote, counts as a "no."

I went and reviewed the elections of every Member of Congress and, guess what, if we had that rule, if every person who was a potentially eligible voter would be counted as a "no" vote in your election, not one Member of Congress, even those who get 80 percent, would have been elected because you had more people who didn't vote than you got votes, not one Member of Congress; but that would be fair for the working people of America according to the Republicans here in the House. That was an incredibly egregious provision, outrageous.

So then we move to the Senate. Well, we go through this little thing last summer where we actually shut down the FAA. Now, I know you don't care about 4,000 Federal employees, that's fine. But you also put out of work 78,000 people who were working in the private sector on the modernization and updates of our aviation system at our airports—all over wanting and hating unions.

Now, I don't get it. I don't get why you hate unions and working people. I really don't understand that.

So here we come to the final product, and the final product will make it much easier for someone in the anti-labor airline out there, perhaps, to deunionize in, say, a merger or even in an election because their furloughed employees would count in an election. You don't know who they are, where they are. They get to vote. And you have to have an election to have an election, and you have to win the election to have an election.

This is not a fair provision. We need the changes in this bill, but we do not need to attack the working people of the United States of America.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just say that we did not change the provision of the law, that it still requires the same provisions that the NMB put in place that changed 70 years of labor law. Of anyone who shows up—if there are 1,000 people in the union and 200 show up—101 can have a vote and go into the union. We did change a requirement, and actually, I didn't negotiate it specifically.

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

Mr. MICA. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

That was negotiated by our Mr. BOEHNER, our Speaker, and the leadership controlled by the Democrats in the Senate. In fact, it is fair to labor because it does require a certain number of people to sign up to have the election.

I think it's a good compromise. The House voted to do away with the provision that the gentleman spoke about. Republicans are concerned and want to help labor. In fact, the vice-chair of our subcommittee, Mr. CRAVAACK, is a card-carrying member of the union. So that's bogus.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in support of the conference report of H.R. 658.

To begin with, I think I recognized our chairman gave accolades to all those he worked with, and I think we owe accolades back to him and his fine staff.

The word "transportation" indicates travel, and he's traveled all over this country to bring this bill together. I don't think he's turned anybody down that's asked him to come down to help them with their area and given us due consideration.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, in working with our Senate counterparts, helped write title IX, reauthorizing Federal Aviation, Research and Development. We also worked with our friends on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to draft various sections relating to the FAA's NextGen Air

Transportation System in title II, the section relating to Unmanned Aircraft Systems in title III, and the provision addressing commercial space-launch licenses.

I appreciated working with JERRY COSTELLO on that line. He has been a gentleman and we'll miss him.

The FAA underpins our Nation's economy and helps sustain a high quality of life, enabling people to travel safely, reliably, conveniently, and relatively inexpensively to virtually every corner of the Nation and the world. It's a 24-7 operation, staffed by highly trained and dedicated controllers and technicians who rely on evolving technologies to ensure mission success. A robust research and development program was fundamental to FAA's role. The NextGen program, which is expected to cost well over \$20 billion when completed, will modernize our air traffic control system to accommodate ever-increasing numbers of flights, but doing so safely, efficiently, and with less fuel burn.

Even though FAA is a highly automated, technologically driven agency, one of the peculiar ironies is its low level of investment in R&D. For fiscal year 2012, FAA requested an R&D budget of \$386 million, which amounts to slightly less than 2.5 percent of the agency's total budget. That's a small level of investment for an agency that relies heavily on automation and is only made possible because of aeronautics-related R&D activities funded by the National Space Administration, which is carefully coordinated with the FAA and the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that Mr. MICA and his leadership were able to bring closure on this matter and on this important bill.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who is not only a member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, but also our ranking Democrat on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank the chairman and ranking member of the full committee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as well as the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

I would simply say that, at the end of this year, I will have completed two decades on both of these committees. On committees is where you develop most of your friendships.

JERRY COSTELLO and his wife, Georgia, have been one of those true friendships that I have experienced, and I'll miss him greatly and I'll miss her greatly when he retires. I hope they'll visit often.

□ 1020

My role as a conferee on this conference committee was as ranking member of the Science, Space, and

Technology Committee, and I would like to highlight some of the provisions in the bill that fall within the jurisdiction of this committee.

The NextGen modernization authorized in this bill will transform the National Airspace System. Through NextGen's satellite-based traffic management, we will be able to address increased congestion in our Nation's skies while improving safety and reducing the environmental footprint of our air transport. Transitioning to a GPS-based air traffic control system will allow airlines to reduce flight delays, save fuel, and cut the amount of harmful emissions from aircraft engines. There is no doubt that the successful implementation of NextGen will boost our economy and enable the creation of more jobs.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Center for Excellence to develop innovations in jet fuel production, spurring the development of new and better energy technologies.

Through the conference committee, we were able to improve upon the version initially passed by the House of Representatives; but as with all legislation, there were many compromises, and there were several aspects of this legislation which I believe could further be improved, as with any piece of legislation. On balance, however, the conference report contains needed policy direction and authorizations that warrant Member support.

While the funding proposed for research and development is less than I believe we need to invest, the conference report represents an improvement over the funding levels in the House-passed bill.

I'm also disappointed that the commercial space transportation provision included in this conference report was done so without the benefit of a serious review of its impacts. I expect that Chairman HALL and I will be taking a serious look at these issues associated with commercial space transportation and this provision during the remainder of the session of this Congress.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I am, however, pleased that a number of policy provisions we worked on in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee have been included in this conference report. For example, the House mandates FAA research on methods and procedures to improve confidence in and the timeliness of certification of new technologies for introduction into the National Airspace System.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is much work to be done to keep our skies safe, but it is certainly time for Congress to act. This reauthorization is the culmination of years of work that has not been fair to the FAA and its employees who are trying to figure out whether

they're going to exist or not with 23 extensions. So with the guidance to pursue its long-term initiatives, we will take our aviation system into the 21st century, and I urge my colleagues to support this imperfect bill. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet experienced a perfect bill.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the young, dynamic leader and chair of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 658, reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration through fiscal year 2015.

Early last year, the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee held an oversight hearing on FAA's research and development programs. On March 9, 2011, Science Committee Chairman RALPH HALL introduced H.R. 970, the Federal Aviation Research and Development Act of 2011. A month later, it was reported out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. The bill was ultimately incorporated into H.R. 658, which is now before us.

FAA's Research, Engineering, and Development account funds a number of programs and projects that are essential to the agency's ongoing safety, capacity, and air traffic modernization efforts.

To give a few examples of its safety-related activities, FAA conducts research on the flammability of materials used in airplane cabins and on methods to improve fire suppression systems; research on mitigation of aircraft icing, on early detection of cracks and failure modes related to aging aircraft; and improving our understanding of human factors.

In the environmental arena, examples include research on fuel additives to replace lead in aviation gasoline that powers piston-engine aircraft and better characterizing aviation's impact on local air quality.

With regard to air traffic control, FAA is investing a considerable portion of its R&D funding on the NextGen modernization program to increase the capacity of air space, improve safety, and provide for more efficient routings.

Most of FAA's R&D is managed out of its technical center located at the Atlantic City, New Jersey, airport; but as many Members are aware, FAA also engages a large number of leading research universities using competitively selected cooperative research grants.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fiscally responsible R&D provision funding FHA's Research, Engineering, and Development account at its current spending level of \$168 million a year for each year through 2015. This is well below amounts proposed by the Senate during conference negotiations.

I support this conference report and urge Members to support it as well, and I thank Mr. MICA for all his hard work.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), our ranking member on the House Education and the Workforce Committee. He is a true friend and leader of the interests of all working men and women in this country, especially our coal miners.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. This compromise stands as an example of why it is counterproductive to negotiate with hostage takers.

Initially, the Republicans insisted that to keep the FHA up and running we make union elections as unfair as possible. For instance, they said that in a union election we should count anyone who did not vote in that election as a "no" vote. Members of Congress immediately recognized that none of us would win those elections and none of us would be here today; and if it is unfair for us, it must also be unfair for the workers of this country. The Republicans gave up that demand thanks to the Democrats. The rule providing for fair elections is protected.

Instead of succeeding at making union elections unfair, this conference report makes these elections difficult, if not impossible, to hold at all. This report contains numerous statutory changes, not rules changes, but statutory changes, that will make it harder for workers to get an election and have a voice at work. A voice at work is a fundamental right granted to every worker in this Nation by the laws of this Nation. These changes will require an act of Congress to undo.

The compromise leads to absurdities. Under the election rule, which is safe for the time being, workers need a majority of actual votes to win in a union election, and that is fine. Under the conference report, to even hold an election, workers must first get a majority of all of the eligible workers to sign cards supporting the unions. These are nationwide units stretched across the country. You don't have access to all of those workers. You don't even know where many of them are. In the airlines, many of them may have been furloughed for a number of years.

Imagine if a congressional election were run this way. To get on the ballot, you first need a majority of all of the voters in your district to sign cards saying they supported you, but you didn't know who those voters were and you didn't know where they lived. None of us would be elected.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. None of us would be elected under this requirement. In fact, there probably wouldn't even be an election.

Once again, we wouldn't run under these conditions. We wouldn't partici-

pate in an election under these conditions, and yet we are insisting that American workers have their elections rigged in this fashion. At this point, especially when you see how it might work in airline mergers, there again this rule works against the workers in trying to assemble the election unit.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill. It undermines the rights of American workers for no purpose other than to satisfy the ideological demands of the Republicans and their special interest backers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this conference report.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, a senior member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 658.

This legislation goes a long way in addressing some concerns I have had regarding our Nation's aviation enterprise. Two of those provisions I would highlight this morning:

The first is an extension of a provision from legislation that I supported back in 2004 when I was chairman of the Space Subcommittee of the House Science Committee.

□ 1030

Let me note that these provisions inaccurately were just described as not having had hearings. There were lots of hearings on these provisions. The provisions relate to the FAA Office of Commercial Space Transportation and are designed to make certain the FAA does not limit the development of the commercial human spaceflight industry without specific data about what will increase safety. This extension will encourage continued research and development while building industry-wide flight experience so these companies can best serve new and existing markets. This includes expanding the research portfolio for federally funded science in the upper atmosphere and in space.

The second provision provides a slight increase in the number of flights from Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport so that it can accommodate these flights to and from the west coast. This small increase will help my constituents in southern California and all Americans in the western States to meet their Representatives in Washington, DC, or visit the Smithsonian or perhaps enjoy the cherry blossoms in the spring. It will also enable those from the Washington area to visit California, California's beaches and California's sunshine and perhaps maybe want to join the Freedom Surf Team. This legislation takes us a step closer to removing the unnecessary and unfair restriction on flights to and from the west coast.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tle lady from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN, who is our ranking member on the Railroads Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank Chairman MICA and Ranking Member RAHALL for their work in bringing the FAA bill to the floor; but I particularly want to thank Mr. COSTELLO because, without his leadership and working this bill through for many years, we would not have a bill on the floor. The public really owes you a great debt of gratitude, and I want to thank you.

I think the aviation community deserves a long-term aviation bill so they can plan for the future needs of the traveling public. We have had 23 extensions already, and it's really time to send a bill to the President, but this is not a perfect bill. And I don't support the labor compromises in this bill, and I don't believe it should have been in the aviation bill in the first place; but our airports, airlines, and passengers have waited too long for these important safety provisions.

My home State of Florida relies on air service to support our tourist-based economy. We have 20 primary airports, 22 reliever airports, and 57 general aviation airports, with our top three airports generating close to 45 million enplanements per year. These airports help create jobs and grow the economy.

And I've really got to say that if we don't pass this, there probably will not be any opportunities for people to work in transportation, because the piece that we passed at 3 o'clock this morning out of the Transportation Committee is the worst bill I have seen in the 30 years I've been elected. I've been in transportation 10 years in the Florida house and close to 20 here, and it was truly the worst bill I have ever seen.

When people from California went into the bill and took almost \$1 billion from the people from California, people from Houston took it, not only taking the safety of the public, I mean taking the transportation dollars and doing away with all of the regulations.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentle lady 1 additional minute.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It is truly a sad day for transportation, and this will probably be our only work product because Members come to the floor, and they rail about the Senate. Well, let me tell you something. The Senate doesn't have to take up our bad work. In fact, this bill, this transportation bill, should be dead on arrival when it gets to the Senate.

I will do all I can to continue to work to put people to work and work for making sure that we have a transportation and infrastructure bill that will really put people to work; because we know, for every billion dollars we spend, it generates 44,000 jobs.

This is truly the worst bill I've ever seen.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to hear the cooperative tone of the other side of the aisle, which had the opportunity, when it controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, to pass a bill and failed to do so. But I'm really encouraged today by their willingness to come together in a bipartisan effort on behalf of the American people and to get one of the most important job creation infrastructure bills and pieces of legislation done, which is our responsibility.

I yield 1 minute to the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I would be remiss to see the discussion of this conference report conclude without expressing my admiration and appreciation of the service of our colleague, JERRY COSTELLO, for whom I suspect this may be the last FAA reauthorization, although I know he will not be riding off into the sunset. He will be very much around in one capacity or another, continuing to play an important role in developing public policy and affairs.

Both as the ranking Republican and again as chairman, it has been a pleasure to work with him. I think he has always been open to comments and suggestions. It has been a team effort, especially through the leadership that he has taken in grabbing the bits and helping to establish focus at the FAA for the NextGen effort, which was floundering when he became chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee. It is a major contribution, I think, to an important sector of our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I, too, want to rise today to acknowledge both the chairman and the ranking member. I know that this has not been an easy task. And I certainly want to express my appreciation to Mr. COSTELLO for the work that he has done and the friendship he has shown to Members, but also the understanding that he has had for this industry.

For those of us who represent airports, I cannot deny that this is an important bill and legislative initiative. So let me thank you and thank you, as well, for the late hours that all of you who are on the Transportation Committee engaged in.

Might I, for a moment, before I speak of this bill, thank the ranking member and Congresswoman BROWN and Congressman JOHNSON for saving Houston, again, in its light rail. This is something I've worked for for almost 20

years, and the amendment last evening that would have defunded Houston's rail, light rail, was absurd and, frankly, an outrage. I hope, as we proceed, we'll find a way to recognize that Members' projects for their constituents for regional mobility should not be tampered with by those living miles away from their community. So I am just thankful for the recognition of the importance of rail and job creation.

As I indicated, I do rise in support of the infrastructure aspects of this bill. We cannot deny that I am grateful for the airport trust fund language dealing with how do you do the airport fees for the NextGen technology; but I serve as the ranking member on the Transportation Subcommittee, and there is language in there about TSO officers. Remember, we were privatized on 9/11.

Despite having never been debated by the Committee on Homeland Security—the committee of jurisdiction—and having no Members being appointed conferees on behalf of the FAA conference committee, section 830 of the conference report for the FAA reauthorization has been tampered with.

□ 1040

It limits TSA's flexibility to approve or deny an application from an airport to opt out of using the Federal screening workforce for passenger and baggage screening. Let me remind you, the airports had privatized security on the day of 9/11. That's why we went to the transportation security officers.

It places an arbitrary time limitation of 120 days on TSA to determine whether approval of an airport's application would compromise security, affect cost efficiency or the effectiveness of screening capability.

It increases administrative burdens on TSA by requiring a tedious paperwork exercise each time an application is denied.

It provides a waiver for the existing law that requires private screening, and it says that we shall do it.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

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

It provides a waiver for the existing law that requires a private screening company contracted will be owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States, meaning that it waives the fact that you have to be a United States citizen to provide security for those who are traveling.

And it requires—it says you "must" privatize some of these airports. Did we learn from 9/11?

So besides the poison pill on labor, counting people who don't even show up to vote, now we have a situation where we are forcing our Nation's airports to privatize their security.

I ask my colleagues to reflect on this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 658, "the FAA Air Transportation Mod-

ernization and Safety Improvement Act." This bill would authorize appropriations, mainly over the 2011–2014 period, for activities of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, and other federal programs related to aviation.

In addition, the measure contains intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, UMRA, because it would impose new requirements on both public and private entities that own aircraft or airports. CBO estimates that the aggregate cost of intergovernmental mandates in the bill would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$71 million in 2011, adjusted annually for inflation).

It would impose additional private-sector mandates on operators of certain aircraft, entities registering or obtaining certification with the FAA, commercial air carriers, employees in air or rail industries, and unions.

As a Senior Member on the House Homeland Security Committee I have been one of the foremost proponents for the swift passage of the FAA Reauthorization Act. But in its current form I cannot vote for this measure. Our national air transportation system is fundamental for the future growth of our economy. However, Congress must ensure our safety and our national security is not at risk without a comprehensive, long-term reauthorization of the FAA Act and not with Homeland Security issues being decided. There are two provisions that have been placed in this bill which are poison pills and must be addressed prior to its passage.

Despite having never been debated by the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee of jurisdiction, and no Members being appointed conferees on behalf of the Committee, section 830 of the Conference Report for the FAA Reauthorization deals with the Transportation Security Agency, TSA, which falls under the jurisdiction of the House Homeland Security committee which I sit on.

Under this Conference Report TSA will be limited in approving or denying an application from an airport to 'opt-out' of using the federal screening workforce for passenger and baggage screening. It also places an arbitrary time limitation of 120 days on TSA to determine whether approval of an airport's application would compromise security, affect cost-efficiency or the effectiveness of screening capabilities.

It also increases administrative burdens on TSA by requiring a tedious paperwork exercise each time an application is denied. And lastly it provides a waiver for the existing law that requires a private screening company contracted with be owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States.

As concerned as I am about the aviation security policy changes made in the bill, I am equally concerned about the process that got us to this point. The Committee on Homeland Security has sole jurisdiction over TSA. It has debated several aviation security bills during the 112th Congress, including a TSA Authorization bill.

The language in the Conference Report to the FAA Reauthorization was never debated by the Committee and no hearings were held by the Committee to examine the merits of the changes. Indeed, the Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation Security is scheduled to have a hearing on the program addressed in this legislation next week with

the Administrator of TSA set to testify. Unfortunately, it appears that hearing will come up "a day late and a dollar short."

Section 830 of the Conference Report for the FAA Reauthorization:

Limits TSA's flexibility to approve or deny an application from an airport to "opt-out" of using the federal screening workforce for passenger and baggage screening;

Places an arbitrary time limitation of 120 days on TSA to determine whether approval of an airport's application would compromise security, affect cost-efficiency or the effectiveness of screening capabilities;

Increases administrative burdens on TSA by requiring a tedious paperwork exercise each time an application is denied; and

Provides a waiver for the existing law that requires a private screening company contracted with be owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States.

As concerned as I am about the aviation security policy changes made in the bill, I am equally concerned about the process that got us to this point. The Committee on Homeland Security has sole jurisdiction over TSA. It has debated several aviation security bills during the 112th Congress including a TSA Authorization bill.

The language in the Conference Report to the FAA Reauthorization was never debated by the Committee and no hearings were held by the Committee to examine the merits of the changes. Indeed, the Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation Security is scheduled to have a hearing on the program addressed in this legislation next week with the Administrator of TSA set to testify. Unfortunately, it appears that hearing will come up a day late and a dollar short.

The National Mediation Board, NMB, has ruled that in order to organize, aviation workers need to have a majority of the voting workers for that particular election. My Republican colleagues however overturned the NMB determination by requiring a majority of all workers, rather than a majority of all voting workers. This has significantly watered down the ruling by the NMB. I cannot stand by and witness the rights of workers being stripped away one piece at a time. If this is the standard that is going to be set for workers who wish to form a Union, then Members of Congress in our fine Democracy should also have the same standards. Rather than a majority of voting citizens, it should be a majority of citizens. If this is not a requirement upon which our democracy is based. It should not be the requirement for Unions.

I believe that aviation contributes over 1.2 trillion in economic activity and provides 11 million jobs annually. Indeed, the partial FAA shut down had a negative impact on the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, furloughed employees, and stop work order measures that have halted construction on key infrastructure projects, such as the \$25 million construction of Replacement TRACON in Houston. However, something must be done to address the privatization of airports—the impact on TSOs as well as the ability of workers to have a fair and democratic vote.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. I would be pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to one of the most distinguished chairs of the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, a good friend, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to congratulate you.

For those who condemn this bill, remember, we have not had a reauthorization FAA for many, many years. And I think this has been well thought out. This bill will do the job, and we should get it done for the American people.

This is a process of compromise. And we've done this with the Senate side, which is really the problem with most of these debates we have as far as conferences go. But it would be a sad day if we didn't pass this legislation, because the work has gone into it and it does solve lots of problems. It gives assurity for the FAA: they can plan ahead, make our airports safer, make our flyers safer, and have the navigations necessary.

So I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member getting this bill done. The negotiating part was very difficult, but they've done a good job.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, ranking member on our House Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. As the Member of Congress who represents Los Angeles International Airport, also known as LAX, I know we need a multiyear FAA reauthorization.

LAX is the world's sixth busiest airport. LAX creates an estimated 59,000 jobs in or near the airport and has a total annual economic impact estimated at \$60 billion.

In 2008, 60 million passengers and 1.8 million tons of freight and mail passed through LAX. All of this economic activity depends upon the FAA and the work that it does every day to guarantee a safe and efficient air travel system. My district also includes the Western-Pacific Regional Office of the FAA in Hawthorne, California, where dedicated FAA engineers and program managers plan improvements of airport operations.

I'm extremely disappointed that this bill contains changes to labor laws affecting the dedicated workers at our Nation's airlines and railroads. This labor provision increases the percentage of employees who must express interest in having an election regarding union representation from 35 percent to 50 percent. This provision was included without consultation of the workers who will be affected and without a vote on the House floor. It is unfortunate and divisive, and there is no reason for it to be in this bill.

Last August, the FAA was forced to shut down many of its operations because the House of Representatives refused to pass a simple bill to extend its funding reauthorization. As a result,

4,000 FAA employees were placed on furlough. Those affected included many of the FAA's engineers, scientists, research analysts, administrative assistants, computer specialists, program managers, environmental protection specialists, and community planners. These government workers were being forced to live without pay for 13 days and were unable to do their jobs developing our air traffic infrastructure and serving the flying public.

I would like to support this bill, but this is problematic; and I reserve my comments further on this bill.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO). Once again, I cannot say how much we're going to miss his knowledge and his expertise on this and many other issues on our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, but I yield him the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL. We've worked very closely together on this legislation. And over the next 9 or 10 months of my service to complete my term, we're going to continue to work together.

I want to thank Chairman MICA. We do not always agree on every issue, but we work together in an open process. He has extended many courtesies to me, and I appreciate his friendship and his leadership. No one wanted to bring this bill to the floor more than he, and a number of us as well. But he has done his very best. He said when he took over as chairman that he was going to bring an FAA bill and a highway bill to the floor, and I think he has every intention to do that. And we're halfway there as of today.

And let me say, Mr. PETRI, who, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee for 4 years, I could not have had a better ranking member. Now as ranking member, I could not have a better chair as far as a working relationship, and we've done things in a bipartisan manner. So I thank the chairman, and I thank the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member.

Let me conclude by saying that this is not a perfect bill. I have major concerns with the NMB. It should not be in this bill. And if in fact there are problems as a result of the provisions put in this bill, it is my intent, and the intent of many on our side, to come back and try and address that in an appropriate way.

There are many provisions in this bill that will enhance safety; and there are a number of provisions in this bill that will protect workers and workers' rights over at the FAA and the unions that represent employees at the Federal Aviation Administration.

So I will be supporting the conference report.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. First, I'd like to insert in the RECORD a list of the staff who worked on H.R. 658.

Mr. Speaker, as I close today on this historic legislation, again, I can't thank enough folks like Mr. COSTELLO, who will be leaving us; Mr. RAHALL, our ranking member; the leader of the committee, Mr. PETRI; and others who have been here helping and working on this.

I think Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. YOUNG summed it up: this is the work of many people. It is not exactly what any one of us individually would offer. The important thing is this provides some certainty in an uncertain time. This process is very difficult; the Founding Fathers wanted it that way. But the American people want us to get the job done.

Now, just to be factual, the other side, again, had 4 years in which they controlled this body, the United States Senate, and 2 years in which they had significant majorities and the Presidency; and they could not get it done. They did 17 extensions. Let me praise Mr. DEFAZIO; I didn't see him here. He and I helped lead the effort to pass, in 2003, a 4-year bill that expired in 2007. That means for the past 5 years we have not had a revised and updated policy for our aviation system and for the FAA. And that hurts the system, it hurts the American people, it hurts looking for safety improvements in the process, and it hurts people looking for expanded opportunities to be employed.

□ 1050

Today, we heard some good news on employment, and the good news is that some of the policies that went amok, the spending that went amok, the new regulations that went amok, this small band of people who were sent here have called a lot of that to a halt. It wasn't productive.

This bill does not have tax increases in it. This bill does not have earmarks in it. This bill does not have any special plums or favors for anyone.

And contrary to what's been said here today, this bill does not adversely affect labor. It's a fairness issue. The House passed a measure that would have codified and changed what the NMB changed in 70 years of labor law, allowing whoever showed up to vote into a union. It set out a fair process, and it was done with a compromise. And if you want to know what the delay was in the first 4 years, let's be frank: it was a labor issue that the Democrats couldn't resolve among themselves, and they controlled the whole process.

So I am here 1 year later as chair. I took some tough measures, and I will take tough measures to see that we get our job done. We stayed until 2:49 this morning to get the next piece of legislation marked up. We have done and passed, and the President has signed, an improvement to our pipeline safety which is so important for energy, ex-

panding energy sources, but also making certain that that energy is coming to us in a safe and responsible manner.

Today, we will pass in the House the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act, accounting for up to 11 percent, I'm told, of our gross domestic product, our economic activity for the country, \$1.3 trillion in business activity, thousands of jobs. And let me tell you too, we can't let labor—you can't let business—go astray. It's our responsibility to set a steady course.

Look, this is a very fragile industry. We just heard an announcement that American Airlines is going to cut more than 10,000, I think 13,000, jobs in bankruptcy. Boeing, we almost lost jobs in South Carolina. We can't play those games, labor and business. They've got to come together and get people working. The aviation industry—not only the passengers, for whom flying is so important—but aviation products, they are the core to our exports. So we can and we must get this done working together.

STAFF WHO WORKED ON H.R. 658, THE FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILL: FEBRUARY 3, 2012

SUBMITTED BY: CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. MICA

House Majority Staff:
Holly Woodruff Lyons
Bailey Edwards
Simone Perez
Andrew Rademaker
Jim Coon
Amy Smith
Suzanne Mullen
Sharon Barkeloo
Tracy Mosebey
Debbie Gebhardt

House Minority Staff:
Giles Giovinazzi
Alex Burkett
Julia Rowe
Jim Zoia
Ward McCarragher
Sarah Blackwood

Senate Majority Staff:
Gael Sullivan
Rich Swayze
Adam Duffy
Ellen Doneski
James Reed
John Williams

Senate Minority Staff:
Jarrod Thompson
Todd Bertosen

I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today's vote is not an easy one. FAA Reauthorization is long overdue, and I support many of the provisions in today's conference report. It makes a much-needed investment in our nation's air infrastructure and includes important new policies to strengthen safety and improve consumer protections.

But unfortunately, this is not a clean transportation bill. Inexplicably, it includes an extraneous, ill-conceived, and completely unnecessary labor provision that has no place in this legislation. Under this bill, it is much more difficult to organize a union for the workers who fly the planes than it is for the workers who build the planes. How does this make sense? We don't know the answer to that, because we haven't had a single hearing on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to vote for a clean, long-term FAA reauthorization and strengthens

our national aviation system. This is not that bill.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report for H.R. 658, the FAA Modernization and Reform Act. This bipartisan, fiscally responsible, four-year authorization measure contains important provisions on air traffic control modernization, safety improvements, and job creation through technology and research.

In particular, the final bill includes important provisions which I co-authored to establish a program for Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) test ranges. Unmanned aircraft are an evolving technology that will play an increasingly larger role in modern aviation. The importance of these systems to our national defense demonstrates their capability.

The uses of UAS have significantly increased, with strong projected growth. UAS are used not only for military applications, but also civilian and commercial purposes, such as border and coastal patrol and monitoring, homeland security, law enforcement, disaster operations, digital mapping and planning, search and rescue, fire detection and management, environmental research and air quality management, air traffic control support, agriculture and fisheries. However, lack of special use airspace to research UAS technologies and detection technique is a potential impediment to the nation's ability to develop this important tool.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with my colleagues in the House Armed Services Committee to create more opportunities for UAS research and investment. Specifically, the FY12 National Defense Authorization Act requires the FAA to work with the Department of Defense and the Air Force to integrate UAS test ranges into the national airspace.

These combined provisions will ensure that the United States remains at the forefront of aerospace development. Ultimately, this is an endeavor that will help strengthen our national defense, spur development of innovative technologies, and most importantly, create jobs for hard-working Americans at a time of record unemployment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the need to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration is urgent. A failure to do so could result in the loss of thousands of jobs and compromise flight safety. This Congress should pass a clean reauthorization without compromising the right of thousands of workers to collectively bargain. This bill does not do that.

Instead, it replaces over 70 years of labor law precedent in which major changes were agreed upon by both workers and management, with changes decided upon by a handful of negotiators in Congress. It will increase the percentage of employees who must petition to have an election about whether to be represented by a union, from 35 percent to 50 percent. The bill makes it even harder for workers to organize and bargain for better wages, working conditions and passenger safety. We must not undermine the workers who have borne the brunt of the great recession. We should stand behind them.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted against the Conference Report for the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. While I appreciate the fact that after twenty six extensions we have finally come together in a bicameral, bipartisan fashion to reauthorize our airport system and help bring it into the 21st century, the

language regarding union elections and mandating that the National Labor Relations Board change its decision is unacceptable. I am sadly forced to vote no.

This bill makes the dangerous precedent of interfering with the National Labor Relations Board. While I am very glad that it does not repeat the disastrous mistake in the original House legislation, I am concerned about the increased requirements to simply hold a union election. There is no reason for Congress to muddle with fair decisions made by the National Labor Relations Board, and I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues insist on doing so.

I appreciate the resolution reached on the National Airport slots issue, and the increased attention paid to airport modernization and NextGen funding. I also appreciate the work of my Senate colleagues in protecting Oregon's scenic spaces. There is much in this bill to support, and it saddens me that so much hard work and bipartisan cooperation is undone by a blatant attack on the rights of our workers to organize.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Chairman CAMP and Chairman MICA for their fine work on the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, and to explain the bill's treatment of the fractional ownership industry.

Fractional aviation has grown rapidly to change how business travels, but Washington doesn't always keep up with the pace of change in business, and fractional aviation was no exception. The Federal Aviation Administration recognized that fractional is non-commercial in 2003, but the Internal Revenue Service is still trying to tax it the same as a commercial airline ticket, despite the fact that fractional owners own their planes. Today we are clarifying and reaffirming that fractional aviation is non-commercial aviation. This bill clearly states that instead of being subject to the commercial ticket tax, as the IRS has asserted, fractional flights will pay the fuel tax used in noncommercial aviation, plus a fractional surtax.

Ohio is the birthplace of aviation. This heritage of aeronautical innovation continues today with cutting edge fractional ownership aircraft programs. This bill will align fractional aviation's tax treatment with the longstanding FAA rules, and help the fractional aviation industry in Ohio and across the country grow even more. I want to thank Chairman CAMP for making this clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further

consideration of the bill (H.R. 3578) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3578 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 257(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as added by section 2, strike "Budgetary" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), budgetary" in paragraph (1) and after paragraph (2) add the following new paragraph:

"(3) MAINTAINING CURRENT FUNDING LEVELS IN REAL (INFLATION-ADJUSTED) TERMS FOR: PELL GRANTS AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS; HEALTH AND ALL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING THAT PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR SENIORS; JOB, HEALTH, AND ALL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING THAT PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS; AND HEALTH RESEARCH, INCLUDING NIH AND RESEARCH TO CURE CANCER.—The discretionary portions of budget functions 500 (Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services), 550 (Health), 570 (Medicare), 600 (Income Security), 650 (Social Security), and 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services), other than unobligated balances, shall be adjusted for inflation as follows:

"(A) The inflator used in paragraph (2) to adjust budgetary resources relating to personnel shall be the percent by which the average of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Cost Index (wages and salaries, private industry workers) for that fiscal year differs from such index for the current year.

"(B) The inflator used in paragraph (2) to adjust all other budgetary resources shall be the percent by which the average of the estimated gross domestic product chain-type price index for that fiscal year differs from the average of such estimated index for the current year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to this bill. It will not kill the bill, and it won't send it back to committee. If adopted, we will then vote on the passage of the bill, as amended.

When families in my district and across the country sit around the kitchen table to try to balance their budgets, they know that costs don't stay the same every year. They know the price of milk and gas and college and health care all go up. Yet H.R. 3578, left unamended, holds the budgetary baseline constant instead of allowing it

to reflect increases in costs, making simple inflation adjustments look like increases in spending.

Ignoring increases in costs will dramatically lower program levels in the baseline. Translated, this means that the priorities we support to help sustain the middle class and those aspiring to it, the programs we pay our taxes to support, will be cut as inflation eats into the accounts set in the budget.

The Republican majority argues that America's middle class must make even more sacrifices to address our debt. The majority's mantra is that austerity alone, spending cuts focused only on nondefense discretionary domestic spending with no additional revenue and without closing any special interest tax loopholes, is all they think should be done.

Never mind that it's largely their policies enforced under the last administration, aided and abetted by the then-Federal Reserve Board chairman, that were largely responsible for the debt situation. Never mind that Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has since testified that this was wrong, that his "unconstrained free market" "winner-take-all" theory had never worked in his 80-plus-year life span. Never mind that in the 1970s, we used to spend 5 percent of our national income on discretionary domestic spending, like education, job training, health, research, veterans, and infrastructure; but more recently, we've already pared that back to 2.5 percent.

With this bill, the majority tries to balance the budget on the backs of workers, middle class families, small businesses, and society's most challenged. They refuse to consider a fair distribution of our tax obligations. They even refuse to close special interest tax loopholes.

This bill, if not amended, chooses shielding the extraordinarily well-off from any fair share of taxes over sustaining Pell Grants, student assistance promising opportunity to families. It chooses allowing hedge fund managers the benefit of especially low tax rates over Meals on Wheels for seniors. And it chooses special tax credits to the mature, extremely profitable oil and gas companies over providing the security of housing for homeless veterans returning from duty in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The austerity-only approach to addressing their largely self-induced debt is not the smart response to our economy's needs. We need to deal with our economic situation in a smart way, as attested by the majority of economists from all across the political divide. We need a gradual approach, balanced between spending cuts and revenue increases fairly distributed. Those need to be appropriately targeted in amount, share and time, not applied in bludgeon fashion like this bill on the floor today.

Choking off the middle class by cutting spending for education, health,

jobs, job training, research, senior care, and our obligations to veterans is shortsighted. Studies and reports from international and national economists tell us that a vibrant middle class is essential for the well-being of our economy; imperative for businesses so they have customers for their goods and services; important to employers so they have the next generation of innovators, inventors, scientists, teachers, engineers, and a generally capable workforce; and important to families and individuals as they seek personal and economic security.

□ 1100

We shouldn't need to argue the moral imperative of meeting our obligations to those suffering from debilitating health conditions and the families that support them; to the care of our seniors, especially those aged, alone and poor; nor to our duty to our military forces, especially the wounded and disabled.

Left as is, this bill is a step to undoing all the progress, however slow, so far made in moving from the near depression caused by the failed policies of 2001–2008. Simply cutting spending on the middle class, at the same time businesses and families have been forced to limit spending, and just as municipalities and the States are trimming back, just adds to the downward spiral of fewer customers for our businesses, less growth for our economy, more layoffs, and on and on in a repeating circle.

Make no mistake, this bill, if not amended, makes the dream of post-high school certificates or degrees or acquired job skills more remote for many; makes the visit of a neighbor and delivery of perhaps the day's only warm meal for seniors less likely; means research on debilitating health conditions or diseases may be delayed, and the cure of cancers a more distant goal; and consigns our veterans to longer periods of homelessness and more difficulty getting the services they need to get a job.

This amendment would allow the effects of inflation to be factored into the budgetary baseline so as to avoid automatic cuts in purchasing power that would otherwise result from this bill. Passing this amendment allows us to at least start on a path to the kind of America most of us envision, or at least it lessens the obstacles to that America that are thrown up by this legislation in its current form.

Let's pass this amendment and start down a path that recalls what makes this country exceptional, the notion that everyone, no matter what economic or social condition one is born into, should have an equal opportunity to reach our goals; to an America reflecting that its people should shoulder and will shoulder any burden, suffer any sacrifice, if shared fairly.

Let's pass this amendment and add back at least a modest degree of balance and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that for those who count on us to be fair and just, or to make smart, targeted, and balanced approaches to our complex challenges, we could at least do that.

I urge support of this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is another one of those commonsense reforms that I'm so proud that this Budget Committee has brought to the floor, time and time again, and will continue throughout the spring.

When I get back home, Mr. Speaker, folks say, ROB, why haven't you gotten this done already? And my friend from Massachusetts has just laid out exactly the reason why. These are politics of division, not of unity. These are politics of fear, not of hope.

And I tell my friend, as he knows very well, this bill does not cut one penny from any of the priorities that he mentioned. My friend knows it to be true. Mr. Speaker, you know it to be true, and I say it to the American people today, what this bill does is to shine sunshine on what has been a budget process cloaked in darkness for far too long. And both parties have been complicit in that, Mr. Speaker, and both parties are going to unite today to change that history.

Mr. Speaker, do folks back home want to see over 50 different duplicative job training programs plussed up year after year after year, without any regard to their efficacy? No, they don't.

Do folks back home want to see education programs that have failed our children time and time again plussed up, while those education programs that are successful go needy? No, they don't.

Mr. Speaker, do folks want to see those income security programs that are providing insecurity to folks back home plussed up at the expense of those programs that can be a hand out of poverty? I tell you they do not.

This bill does one thing and one thing only: This bill provides honesty in our budget process. And if this motion to recommit passes, we will return to the days where confusion, rather than clarity, is the touchstone of this budget process.

Chairman RYAN has given us an opportunity, with this legislation, to bring the American people into this debate, to make the budgeting here in this body look like the budgeting around the dinner table back home.

Are expenses going up in this country? They are, Mr. Speaker. Are times tough in this country? Yes, they are. When we spend \$10 today and \$12 tomorrow, the American people know that we're spending more and not less.

We can continue to put lipstick on this budget pig, as this motion to recommit would have us do, Mr. Speaker,

but I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit and unite to throw open the doors of this institution and bring in budget sunshine once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3578, if ordered, and adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 658.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 238, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—177

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

NAYS—238

Adams	Gohmert	Nunes
Aderholt	Nunnelee	Nunnelee
Akin	Gosar	Olson
Alexander	Gowdy	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Paulsen
Amodi	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Austria	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Peterson
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barletta	Grimm	Pitts
Barrow	Guinta	Platts
Bartlett	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barton (TX)	Hall	Pompeo
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Berg	Harris	Quayle
Biggart	Hartzler	Reed
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Ribble
Blackburn	Herger	Rigell
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Roby
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jones	Roskam
Camp	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Campbell	Kelly	Royce
Canseco	King (IA)	Runyan
Cantor	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kingston	Scalise
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Cassidy	Klme	Schmidt
Chabot	Labrador	Schock
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coble	Lance	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Latham	Sessions
Cravaack	LaTourette	Shimkus
Crawford	Latta	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
DesJarlais	Lummis	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dold	E.	Stutzman
Dreier	Manzullo	Sullivan
Duffy	Marchant	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Thornberry
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Emerson	McCaul	Tipton
Farenthold	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Fincher	McCotter	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Walberg
Flake	McKeon	Walden
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McMorris	Webster
Flores	Rodgers	West
Forbes	Meehan	Westmoreland
Foxx	Mica	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gardner	Mulvaney	Womack
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gerlach	Myrick	Yoder
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gibson	Noem	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Burton (IN)	Heinrich	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Hinchev	Shuler
Carson (IN)	Issa	Sires
Filner	Mack	Speier
Fortenberry	Paul	Turner (OH)
Hahn	Polis	

□ 1129

Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. COHEN, LEVIN, and CROWLEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 31, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 235, nays 177, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—235

Adams	Foxx	McCaul
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Akin	Gallely	McCotter
Alexander	Gardner	McHenry
Amash	Garrett	McIntyre
Amodi	Gerlach	McKeon
Austria	Gibbs	McKinley
Bachmann	Gibson	McMorris
Bachus	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Barletta	Gohmert	Meehan
Barrow	Goodlatte	Mica
Bartlett	Gosar	Miller (FL)
Barton (TX)	Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Bass (NH)	Granger	Mulvaney
Benishek	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Berg	Green, Gene	Myrick
Biggart	Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer
Bilbray	Griffith (VA)	Noem
Bilirakis	Grimm	Nugent
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Nunes
Black	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Blackburn	Hall	Olson
Bonner	Hanna	Palazzo
Bono Mack	Harper	Paulsen
Boustany	Harris	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Pence
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Pitts
Buchanan	Heck	Platts
Bucshon	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Buerkle	Herger	Pompeo
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Camp	Hultgren	Reed
Campbell	Hunter	Rehberg
Canseco	Hurt	Reichert
Cantor	Jenkins	Renacci
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Ribble
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rivera
Chaffetz	Jones	Roby
Coble	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Cole	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Cravaack	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kinzing (IL)	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kline	Rooney
Culberson	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Roskam
Denham	Lance	Ross (FL)
Dent	Landry	Royce
DesJarlais	Lankford	Runyan
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Dold	LaTourette	Scalise
Dreier	Latta	Schilling
Duffy	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schock
Duncan (TN)	Long	Schweikert
Ellmers	Lucas	Scott (SC)
Emerson	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Farenthold	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Fitzpatrick	E.	Shimkus
Flake	Manzullo	Shuster
Fleischmann	Marchant	Simpson
Fleming	Marino	Smith (NE)
Flores	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland

Stearns	Turner (NY)	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Upton	Wittman
Stutzman	Walberg	Wolf
Sullivan	Walden	Womack
Terry	Walsh (IL)	Woodall
Thompson (PA)	Webster	Yoder
Thornberry	West	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Tipton	Whitfield	Young (IN)

NAYS—177

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

NOT VOTING—20

Cardoza	Graves (MO)	Paul
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Shuler
Carter	Heinrich	Sires
Farr	Hinchev	Smith (NJ)
Filner	Issa	Speier
Fortenberry	Mack	Turner (OH)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1135

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 32, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 658, FAA REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 169, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—248

Adams	Costello	Hayworth
Aderholt	Cravaack	Heck
Akin	Crawford	Hensarling
Alexander	Crenshaw	Herger
Amodel	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Austria	Culberson	Hirono
Bachmann	Davis (CA)	Huelskamp
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Denham	Hultgren
Barrow	Dent	Hunt
Bartlett	DesJarlais	Hurt
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Bass (NH)	Dold	Johnson (IL)
Benishek	Dreier	Johnson (OH)
Berg	Duffy	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Biggart	Ellmers	Jones
Bilbray	Emerson	Jordan
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Kelly
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Black	Flake	Kingston
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Bonner	Fleming	Kline
Bono Mack	Flores	Lance
Boren	Forbes	Landry
Boswell	Fox	Lankford
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gallegly	LaTourette
Brooks	Gardner	Latta
Buchanan	Garrett	Lewis (CA)
Bucshon	Gerlach	Lipinski
Buerkle	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Burgess	Gibson	Long
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Calvert	Goodlatte	Lucas
Camp	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Campbell	Granger	Lummis
Canseco	Graves (GA)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Cantor	Graves (MO)	Manzullo
Capito	Griffin (AR)	Marchant
Carnahan	Griffith (VA)	Marino
Carter	Grimm	Matheson
Cassidy	Guinta	McCarthy (CA)
Chabot	Guthrie	McCaul
Chaffetz	Hall	McClintock
Coble	Hanabusa	McCotter
Coffman (CO)	Hanna	McHenry
Cole	Harper	McIntyre
Conaway	Harris	McKeon
Cooper	Hartzler	McKinley
Costa	Hastings (WA)	

McMorris Rodgers	Rehberg	Simpson
Meehan	Reichert	Smith (NE)
Mica	Renacci	Smith (NJ)
Miller (FL)	Ribble	Smith (TX)
Miller (MI)	Rigell	Southerland
Miller, Gary	Rivera	Stearns
Murphy (PA)	Roby	Stivers
Myrick	Roe (TN)	Sullivan
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Noem	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Nugent	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Nunes	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Nunnelee	Rokita	Tipton
Olson	Rooney	Turner (NY)
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Paulsen	Roskam	Walberg
Pearce	Ross (AR)	Walden
Pence	Ross (FL)	Walsh (IL)
Perlmutter	Royce	Webster
Petri	Runyan	West
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Platts	Scalise	Whitfield
Poe (TX)	Schilling	Wilson (SC)
Polis	Schmidt	Wittman
Pompeo	Schock	Wolf
Posey	Schrader	Womack
Price (GA)	Schweikert	Woodall
Quayle	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Quigley	Scott, David	Young (AK)
Rahall	Sessions	Young (FL)
Reed	Shimkus	Young (IN)
	Shuster	

NAYS—169

Ackerman	Gowdy	Owens
Altmire	Green, Al	Pallone
Amash	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Andrews	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Gutierrez	Payne
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Peters
Becerra	Himes	Peterson
Berman	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Richardson
Broun (GA)	Inslie	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Capuano	(TX)	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chandler	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clay	Labrador	Scott (SC)
Cleaver	Lamborn	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Loebach	Stark
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Stutzman
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Sutton
DeFazio	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney	Tierney
Deutch	Markey	Tonko
Dicks	Matsui	Towns
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Doggett	McCollum	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Velázquez
Doyle	McGovern	Visclosky
Duncan (SC)	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Meeke	Wasserman
Ellison	Michaud	Schultz
Engel	Miller (NC)	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Moore	Waxman
Fattah	Moran	Welch
Frank (MA)	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Fudge	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Napolitano	
Gohmert	Neal	
Gonzalez	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—15

Cardoza	Heinrich	Paul
Carson (IN)	Hinchee	Shuler
Finer	Honda	Sires
Fortenberry	Issa	Speier
Hahn	Mack	Turner (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1142

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 33, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently not recorded on rollcall 33, on the Conference Report on H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization Act. I intended to vote “no” on the conference report because of the provisions it contains that would be devastating to workers’ rights and labor relations. These provisions take away the right for a secret ballot and codify minority-rule elections, as well as allowing for wholesale decertification of a whole host of unions.

I do not believe that a conference report on an aviation safety bill is the place to rewrite longstanding labor laws and impose unrelated and controversial labor provisions that will ultimately serve to harm both airline and railroad workers, and so I intended to vote “no” on rollcall 33.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1734, CIVILIAN PROPERTY REALIGNMENT ACT

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–385) on the resolution (H. Res. 537) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come, I am pleased to yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On

Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, which will be announced by the close of business today.

Building upon our legislative agenda this week, the House will consider two more bills next week aimed at reforming the Federal budget process, including H.R. 3521, the Expedited Legislative Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act, a bipartisan bill sponsored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN and cosponsored by Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, as well as H.R. 3581, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, sponsored by Congressman SCOTT GARRETT.

In addition, the House will act on legislation passed in the Senate yesterday, commonly referred to as the STOCK Act.

Finally, the House may consider H.R. 1734, the Civilian Property Realignment Act, sponsored by Congressman JEFF DENHAM.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information and would ask him on the timing.

The conference committee has met twice on the payroll tax cut, the unemployment insurance, and the so-called "doc fix," or to ensure the fact that doctors are compensated and will be available for Medicare patients. The conference committee, Mr. Leader, has met twice since December 23. We adopted a motion to instruct, overwhelmingly, through the House to make sure that they reported back by February 17.

□ 1150

I think you may have read my comments in the press that if we do not do it by the 17th, then we're off for a week and we will be back the 27th, 28th, and 29th, come back the night of the 27th, and we'll be jammed at the end on Wednesday, the 29th. We only have 6 full days left before the February break. Now, that does not include our 6:30 start times.

House Democrats, Mr. Leader, stand ready to, frankly, I think, work through the weekend if that were necessary. But I'm very concerned that something that we all want to get done—and I've made the suggestion to my Democratic conferees, and they were equally amused as you are. I understand that.

I will tell you that I have great concerns that we're going to get to the 27th, 28th, and 29th and be in the same kind of confrontation and debacle that we found ourselves in in December. That's not good for your party. In my opinion, it's not good for our party. It's not good for the House and Senate; but it is certainly not good for the 160 million people who are going to be concerned about whether or not, in fact, their tax cut is going to continue, or the Medicare people who are going to

be concerned about whether their doc is going to be available, or the unemployed who are going to be concerned.

Now, of course, for the unemployed, we had some very good news. You didn't mention it in your opening comments, but I'm sure you were as excited as I was about the 257,000 new private sector jobs that were created last month; showed real progress.

But I will tell you that I'm very concerned about the timing and would be delighted to hear the gentleman's thoughts on the success and the progress of the conference committee.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what I would say is the Republicans on the House side, led by Chairman CAMP, have been and are ready to make sure we resolve the issue of the payroll tax holiday extension right now. The issue has been the reluctance on the gentleman's side of the aisle on the other side of the Capitol. So if I thought that working 7 days a week, through weekends and all hours of the day and night would make a difference, I would be all for that as well.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this House continues to act. This House passed a yearlong extension that also did not have the effect of raiding the Social Security trust fund, something that the gentleman and I both want to make sure happens, that we restore the integrity of that fund for the people who are counting on it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say the House also, this week, acted on several measures that, frankly, are very relevant to the work of the conference committee, but yet no action by the Senate. One of those things, as the gentleman knows, was passed out of the House this week. It was a measure calling for a pay freeze at the Federal level for Federal employees, including Members of the House and Senate. This was a bipartisan vote; 309 Members voted for that. It allowed for about \$26 billion in savings that could be easily included in the conference committee deliberations, something that our side continues to want to include, but yet no answer from the Senate majority leader and his conferees.

So, again, I would tell the gentleman, please, we are as anxious as you are to try and resolve these issues.

We had another vote this week, Mr. Speaker, which garnered 400 votes in the House—a bipartisan bill—which called for some necessary reforms to the TANF program. These were reforms which preclude the use of the monies that beneficiaries receive for purchases of services at casinos and other types of establishments, that perhaps those monies could be better spent not in those places; but again, no response from the Senate.

And I would ask the gentleman if he could please direct his urgency towards the majority leader in the Senate to see if we can get this off the dime and resolve the issue of the payroll tax so we can, as the gentleman suggests,

send a very certain signal to the people who are struggling out there, working day in and day out, that their taxes will not go up.

As for the gentleman's suggestion about the job numbers, I don't know if he saw my public statement this morning, but I said that was welcome news, that when you have job creation like that, welcome news, but I also think we can do a lot better.

I was pleased to see that the President came out this week and said he now, too, wants to be a champion of small business; and we say we are happy to work with this White House so that we can provide the help to small businesses. We will be bringing to the floor, before tax day, a small business tax cut bill that goes right at the issue of helping small business people, allowing them more incentive to invest their capital so they can create jobs and we can see this economy really take off.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Of course we have long been a supporter of small business. We believe small business is the engine of our economy. We believe we need to grow entrepreneurs. We need to expand, frankly, small business and the middle class.

It was interesting what the gentleman referred to in response to my question. Yes, we understand that cutting the pay of average working Americans—who happen to be Federal employees, but they're average working Americans—is the way you want to pay for what we do. We, of course, want to pay for it with some of the wealthiest people in our country just contributing a little bit more as opposed to average working people who are struggling by. And, by the way, the sponsor of that piece of legislation to which you referred indicated he was having a tough time getting by supporting his family on the salary that he makes here in Congress.

Now, frankly, we offered, as you know, to have a vote on freezing Members of Congress' salary straight up—not hidden in another bill, but straight up—which I would have supported and my side would have supported overwhelmingly. I presume your side would have supported overwhelmingly. We, of course, didn't get that opportunity because, frankly, our priorities do, in fact, differ.

Average working people as opposed to the best off in America, that's the choice in this conference committee, apparently; because you want to pay for it with average working people taking a hit, and we want to pay for it by just asking just a little more from the wealthiest in America to help us through this tough patch that we're in.

Things are getting better. The gentleman—I haven't seen his release, but I will certainly look at his release. He says we ought to do better. I will tell the gentleman we're doing a lot better.

The gentleman knows that during the last 5 months of the Bush administration, we lost 3,192,000 jobs. The gentleman smiles because, oh, that's history. Well, it is history, and we ought to learn from it because we were following the economic policies the gentleman still continues to press upon the American people. We lost 3,192,000 jobs in 5 months. In the last 5 months, however, we have gained now over 1 million jobs. That's progress. In fact, over the last 22 months, we've gained over 3 million jobs so that we are making significant progress. Not enough. We dug a very, very deep hole and we're trying to get out of it, but the fact of the matter is losing 3 million jobs in 5 months and gaining 1 million jobs in 5 months is about a 4 million job difference.

So I tell my friend both in terms of who ought to pay for the investments that we have agreed we need to make. We don't want to raise taxes on these folks as the economy is still coming back, obviously showing great progress, but we don't want to pay for it with average working people having to pay the price.

□ 1200

I will tell my friend, I was disappointed that we didn't have a separate vote so that Members of Congress could vote straight up on their being frozen. And I will tell my friend that I will work with him, perhaps towards that end.

Now having said that, I am sure the gentleman has been in conversations with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP). Is the gentleman expecting a relatively early report back from the conference committee, hopefully prior to the 18th of February when we might be voting on this?

Mr. CANTOR. Let me respond, if you will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield, certainly.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, first of all, I do hope that we can act in an expeditious manner to accomplish the same goal that he's stated. That I agree with. We need to let the people of this country out there who are working so hard know that they are not going to have their taxes go up on them and that we should allow that certainty for a full year, the position this House has taken from the very beginning.

I would say to the gentleman about his assertions of our policies and those under the last President and perhaps their effect on job creation or job loss, the issue is right now—and my question to the gentleman is, as far as that's concerned: Doesn't he agree that we could be doing better?

And that's my point, Mr. Speaker: we can do better. We can do better by focusing on the private sector small businessmen and -women so that we can empower them to begin to invest and create jobs again. We can do better. That is what we intend to do straight up through policies that affect reduc-

tion of red tape in this town to make it easier for small businessmen and -women to operate; as I indicated before, a bill to be brought forward to provide for a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses.

And I hope if the gentleman says he's for small businesses that he'll join us in a bipartisan way to support a bill that provides for a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses.

Now, I would ask the gentleman as well, he continues to advocate higher taxes for people, higher taxes. That's what we hear: higher taxes on people who make a lot of money. Well, the fact is, the result of that is putting more money into this town, putting more money into the hands of Washington so that Washington can decide where people's money is spent.

We all know we've got a spending problem, and we all know that raising taxes does not dig us out of the hole. So I would just ask the gentleman, Does he think that's going to fix the problem? It's not as if we're saying we don't want to help the people who are out there struggling. That's what we're trying to do. So I'm looking forward to working with him in a bipartisan way to see if we can get resolution on these issues.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. And we all look forward to working together in a bipartisan way. We sure have found great difficulty doing it, however, because we have trouble having a meeting of the minds.

I will tell my friend that what I advocate over and over and over again is paying for what we buy. That's what I advocate. And if you don't want it, don't buy it.

You controlled this town for 8 years from an economic-policy standpoint. I know we were in charge of the Congress for the last 2 years. We couldn't pass anything over George Bush's veto. You and I both know that. So for 8 years, we didn't pay for what we bought; and we went from surplus to deficit. We went from a debt of \$5.6 trillion to a debt of almost \$11 trillion.

Have we added to the debt? Yes, we did. Why? Because we went into the deepest depression, starting in '07, that this country has been in in your lifetime and my lifetime; and I'm a lot older than you. So that's what I advocate: paying for what we buy and having the courage to make decisions on doing exactly that. And very frankly, on your side of the aisle, when you go and say, look, we need to pay for elections, who do you go to? You go to your Members, and you go to people who have some resources that they can contribute to an effort you think is very important.

I think America's efforts are very important. And I think those of us who have done better ought to pay a little more than those who are struggling, as the gentleman refers to. Yes, that's the difference. I believe it's the difference, and I will continue to advocate paying for what we buy. That's why I was for

statutory PAYGO, which George Bush abandoned and which essentially is not being followed today, as I think all of us should do.

So I will tell my friend that I think we ought to do better. I agree with him. And we did do better. We did do better under policies that I supported. We grew 22 million jobs in the nineties. We lost jobs in the 2000s. We went backwards. And the stock market went up 216 percent in the nineties. Under George Bush, it went down 26 percent. Yes, I think we can do better, and we ought to do better. And we ought to do better by investing.

Let me talk a little bit about the bill that the Speaker's talked about, you've talked about, it's been in the news: infrastructure and jobs. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee marked up a controversial highway bill—the gentleman says we want to work together. I agree with that. He and I try to do that. We don't always succeed, but we try to do it. They marked up the bill yesterday for 17 hours and finished around 3 a.m.

I don't know whether the gentleman knows this, but at the start of that debate, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, asked all the members of the Transportation Committee, when the bill was put on, to raise their hand if they had read the bill. You know how many people raised their hand—that's a rhetorical question because I think the gentleman probably hasn't inquired of this—none. On an 800-page bill, not one person raised their hand that they had read the bill. There was a lot of discussion about reading the bill.

There was, of course, as you know, a bipartisan "no" vote. One of the senior members voted against it. This is in stark contrast to the unanimous vote that occurred in the United States Senate on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources also completed a controversial markup on opening ANWR to drilling—as I understand it, you are going to put that in the infrastructure bill—with the clear knowledge that that is a very controversial item that will not pass the United States Senate. You may have the votes here. That is similar to what happened on the payroll tax cut just last December.

If you are going to work on a bipartisan basis, we ought to understand that we are going to have to not try to push on one party or the other things that are unacceptable and won't pass and don't have the votes.

The reason that George Bush signed so many bills that we passed in the Congress in '07 and '08 was because we worked with the administration, and we worked with the Senate. The Senate and the House were controlled by Democrats; President Bush was in office. He signed more than twice as many bills that we passed. Why? Because we worked with him. We would urge you to do the same.

Is the gentleman planning to bring up the infrastructure bill to the floor

soon? And can he tell the Members if it will be considered under an open process? Furthermore, is the majority leader expecting there to be bipartisan cooperation on the infrastructure package so that we do not have to go up against another deadline? As the gentleman knows, on March 31 the highway authorization bill ends. We temporarily included it.

And let me end with this before you answer your question, because Ray LaHood was a leader in this Congress. Ray LaHood was a leader on your side of the aisle. Ray LaHood and I served together for a long time. I don't know whether you've seen his quote, but I think it bears consideration by your side of the aisle of a Republican from middle America—Peoria, Illinois—who your minority leader, Bob Michel, had as his chief of staff.

Here is what he said about the infrastructure bill that was marked up: "This is the most partisan transportation bill that I have ever seen, and it is also the most anti-safety bill I have ever seen." This is a direct quote from Ray LaHood, Republican, former Member of this House for many years, and former chief of staff to the minority leader Bob Michel. "It hollows out our number one priority, which is safety; and frankly, it hollows out the guts of the transportation efforts that we've been about for the last 3 years. It's the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years in public service," Ray LaHood, Politico, February 3. That's today. He said it today, in realtime. This is real breaking news from the Transportation Secretary: the worst transportation bill he has seen in 35 years.

□ 1210

That does not, I tell my friend, bode well for bipartisan cooperation on a piece of legislation that nobody in the committee had read. So I'd ask my friend, do we expect to bring that bill up under those conditions in the near term?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, we expect to vote on the bill the week of the 13th. I think there will be adequate time for Members to review the bill and the text, to the gentleman's concern about Mr. RAHALL's inquiry last night in the committee. That is exactly why we are allowing for the time, so that Members can review such a big bill, a bill that means so many jobs to so many Americans.

I hope that the gentleman will be true to his nature, which is bipartisan, and to work with us, because this American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act is just that; it's a jobs bill. It is a bill that can provide some certainty to our contractors, some certainty to our communities so that we can start to grow again and see jobs proliferate.

But I find it ironic that the gentleman complains about paying for it, because he talks about our wanting to

open up our resources, our resources offshore, our resources in ANWR as, number one, an attempt to allow America to develop finally a national energy policy, but to also promote jobs.

The gentleman knows, as I do, the energy sector provides an awful lot of jobs in plenty parts of this country, and can do a lot more, and is willing. Private capital, willing to deploy to create jobs.

But I find it also ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman complains that there's no bipartisanship because somehow we're not working with the administration. Well, the administration's been absent on all of this. They're not interested in working with us to create a product where we can see jobs created.

As you can see, the Secretary sits in his office and opines and attacks the bill, saying it is all the negative things that he said. Now, that's not a way to collaborate and work together. And the gentleman knows that as well. The gentleman knows that that is certainly not how things have worked in this town if you want to produce a result.

So the gentleman can claim the mantle of wanting to work together and that the administration is being trampled by some action here. He knows good and well, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has been absent in so many of the discussions on so many important issues. And the fact that we differ on policy, yes. But I think the gentleman also knows that reasonable people can disagree, but that doesn't mean that we can't work together to find some things that we agree on.

Certainly, we agree on jobs. The gentleman says we agree on small business. I'm looking for his support of that small business tax credit bill. And we agree on infrastructure spending being an important part of our economy. So I'm looking forward to the next week or so, as the bill works its way to the floor, to hopefully garner his support.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Wonderful, wonderful logic. A Republican leader in this House is appointed to include bipartisan—and the Secretary of Transportation, who was a leader in this House, and the chief of staff of the minority leader of this House, says that the bill you have drafted, that your Members didn't read before they passed it out of committee—and the public, I'm sure, is glad that at least we're going to read it before we pass it. I hope that's the case. I've heard a lot of talk about reading the bills. Nobody read it before they passed it out of committee. And the Republican Secretary of Transportation, former chief of staff of the minority leader, says, my friend, it's the most partisan bill he has ever seen in 35 years.

And then you say, well, I know we passed the most partisan bill in 35 years, but, gee, the administration won't work with us. You don't accept

that premise. I understand that. But it's ironic that you say the administration won't work with you.

You and I both know Ray LaHood happens to be one of the more bipartisan people with whom you and I have served. I've worked frequently with Congressman LaHood when he represented Peoria, as a Republican in the House of Representatives. He and I worked together on a lot of issues. Why? Because he wanted to get things done. He wasn't just simply interested in making political points.

Now, you bring up ANWR in terms of pay-for. I'm for paying this. You didn't hear me say anything about offshore drilling, this and that. I did about ANWR because you and I both know, in a bipartisan way, many of your Members have voted against opening up ANWR, and we have, as the gentleman knows, millions of acres, millions of acres currently available for drilling in Alaska right now as we speak.

So we want to have a bipartisan—but putting an 800-page bill on the table, no chance to read it, passing it in a 17-hour marathon session, and then having clearly no—having not worked at all with Ray LaHood, and if you're telling me that Ray LaHood won't work with Republicans, I simply do not accept that premise. I think that's a disservice to Ray LaHood if that's what you are saying. He is the Secretary of Transportation. And there is no doubt in my mind, none, zero, that if Mr. MICA wants to work with Ray LaHood on a bipartisan bill, Ray LaHood will be here as many hours, days, and weeks as Mr. MICA needs him here, and I think you would, hopefully, agree with that proposition.

Ray LaHood is a Republican, but he is a bipartisan American who wants to get things done for our country and create those jobs of which you speak, which all of us want to do.

We have a jobs bill, by the way, that you have not brought to the floor. What's one of the aspects of that jobs bill? Infrastructure, investing in infrastructure. That bill has languished for 5 months now, not brought to the floor by the majority leader, who has the authority to bring it to the floor, and I've, of course, been urging him to do so.

Now, if he'd like to comment—I have another point, but if he wants to comment on what I have said, I yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. I join the gentleman in thinking Secretary LaHood is a fine gentleman, but all I can say is actions speak louder than words.

What I would say to the gentleman about his request for the President's jobs bill and whether we're bringing the whole bill up for a vote, I'd ask the gentleman, How many Members on his side of the aisle have actually sponsored that bill?

I think that there are certainly many elements of that bill that we can all agree on, and, in fact, we have voted on four separate elements, big elements,

of the President's small business agenda that he announced this week that were part of that bill: crowd funding; many offerings to help small business access financing; a bill to provide for 100 percent depreciation; the provisions that will allow for more ability for small business to see money go to the bottom line so they can grow; and a bill that we passed out of this House to eliminate country caps for immigration for highly skilled workers. All these are part of the President's proposals. All these the House has passed, and they sit, and they sit on the other side of the Capitol.

So I would say to the gentleman, he knows, as well as I do, that more stimulus spending as a part of that, the President's proposal, is something we don't accept, but there's plenty in there that we can agree on.

Back to the notion of bipartisanship. Let's set aside differences and find where we can agree. These are areas that we can agree on. So I would say to the gentleman, please work with us. Please point the ire to the majority leader on the other side of the Capitol and say, bring these bills up. These are jobs bills. The President said so this week.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman knows that a number of those proposals had bipartisan support in this House, I think have bipartisan support over in the Senate. But they need to be paid for, and that's where the contention comes, as the gentleman knows.

Let me ask you, on another subject, if I might, the STOCK Act.

Yet, before I do that, I appreciate the gentleman's observation with respect to those bills that the President has suggested we do that we have done.

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman could yield just for a correction. There's no need for pay-fors on these bills. These bills are something that were cleared out of the House in a revenue neutral way.

Mr. HOYER. The individual bills. You're right.

Mr. CANTOR. Right. So, again, the gentleman is correct in saying there is bipartisan support for these bills. The President supports them. Where's the problem? It's across the hallway here, and if we could actually get the majority there to help move these bills, we could make some progress.

Mr. HOYER. We could make some progress if, frankly, the majority leader could get 60 votes to enact the legislation and transact business on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately, as the gentleman very well knows, the majority leader, HARRY REID, has had very great difficulty getting 60 votes to proceed with business on the floor of the House of the United States Senate. I think that's unfortunate.

But let me move on because the gentleman went from an infrastructure bill, which, as Secretary LaHood said, was the most partisan bill he's seen in 35 years, and shifted to the jobs, on which we agree. The fact of the matter

is that I want to talk about another piece of legislation that the Senate has worked on. We have a bill here. We've asked that it be taken from the floor, from the desk and put on the floor, and that's the STOCK Act. The gentleman has expressed support for the STOCK Act. I'm hopeful that we can pass a House bill and then go to conference with the Senate on a bill in the near future.

Would the gentleman comment on that.

□ 1220

Mr. CANTOR. It has always been my intention to try and act with dispatch on this very important issue and to get the President a bill that he can sign as quickly as possible.

Again, the underlying notion is, as the gentleman believes, we need to make sure that the people that send us here know that we are acting and abiding by the trust that they place in us. That's what the STOCK Act is about. So what we're going to do next week, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, is we are going to act with dispatch. We are going to take up the Senate bill. We are currently reviewing the actions the Senate took on that bill, and we intend to strengthen that bill, again, to do so in a way that can get a bill to the President's desk as quickly as possible so that there is no misunderstanding on the part of the people that sent us here that they can have trust in this institution and the Members, and there is no perception whatsoever that anyone here misuses information that they gain in the performance of their duties for their own personal benefit.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and he says the earliest day possible. I tell my friend that TIM WALZ of Minnesota has had a bill, as the gentleman probably knows, of the STOCK Act—also, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, ranking member of the Rules Committee, has worked on for literally a decade or more—so we have legislation which is available to take, frankly, from the desk, pass that, and go immediately to conference with the Senate.

The gentleman indicates he wants to change the Senate bill. I think that that may be appropriate; but if he does, we're going to have to go to conference in any event. So my suggestion is you take TIM WALZ's bill, act on that, a House bill, and we go to conference on that bill. That seems to me that's the most expeditious way to accomplish what the gentleman says he wants to accomplish in a very quick fashion.

I think TIM WALZ of Minnesota would be happy to hear that and available to work towards that end, along with LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Mr. CANTOR. I say to the gentleman, first of all, I know the gentleman likes to talk about past Congresses. When he was House majority leader, he did not bring this STOCK Act to the floor, and it was a submitted bill. So let's set the record straight. This majority leader is

going to bring a STOCK Act bill to the floor next week.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. WALZ's bill actually would weaken the Senate bill; and it is our intention to pass and get to the President a workable, strong bill that makes sure that we're delivering on the promise that we made to the people that sent us here. I hope the gentleman—I know he wants to join me in the effort to re-install the confidence of the public that we are abiding by that trust.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us, hopefully, agree with what the leader has just said. We clearly want to make sure the American public has confidence and trust in the actions we take in that they are not driven by personal interests but by public interests, by a concern for the welfare of the people we represent in our country.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. CANTOR. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Iran is rapidly building a nuclear weapon. Recent reports reveal that Israel may be preparing to attack Iran. Some critics, including the United States, say that Israel should not attack because it would derail the sanctions process; but sanctions are not fully accomplishing their objective. Russia, China, India, and even Japan all continue to buy Iranian oil.

For Israel, a nuclear-armed Iran threatens its very existence. Ahmadinejad, the little fellow from the desert, says he wants to wipe Israel off the map. Experts agree that Iran soon will have the power to do just that.

Israel has the right to defend itself, the right to be left alone, and the right to prevent its annihilation. Iran cannot get nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest hope for the world is a regime change from within by the people of Iran. The United States should verbally support

the good people of Iran in changing their dictator, but the world should be prepared for nuclear mischief by that tyrant.

And that's just the way it is.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, the 1st of February, begins Black History Month; and on that day I introduced a proposal to have a Congressional Gold Medal issued to civil rights workers—not to each one individually, but collectively.

Black History Month celebrates the history of African Americans in our Nation, and a Gold Medal for civil rights workers is so appropriate because the people who fought for civil rights had to fight their own government to get the rights that were embedded in the Constitution for others, which specifically said that they were three-fifths people and that slavery should exist in this country, and the Jim Crow laws that were passed and approved by this Congress and by the State legislatures continued that for another hundred years.

So the people like JOHN LEWIS and ROBERT FILNER, who serve in this House, the people who engaged in the sit-ins and the marches, that challenged our system and showed it to be wrong and forced it to change itself, not just Dr. King but the Julian Bonds and the farmers and the Ennises and the Belafontes, they deserve recognition. They should be recognized by this Congress for what they did because they took a wrong in America and they righted it, and they continued to serve and make this country greater for all people based on the principles of the United States Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, which don't really fulfill their destinies without the efforts of the civil rights workers who've made the work of Jefferson and our Founding Fathers true.

JOBS BILL

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about a jobs bill that just passed out of the Rules Committee and will be on the House floor next week. H.R. 1734 is a bill that will address all of our civilian properties across the Nation, things we don't need, identifying property that can be redeveloped.

Let me just give you one example of something that is happening right here in the District of Columbia. The Old Post Office, which will be redeveloped, keeping it in its historic fashion, will create 150 jobs just in the construction phase of redevelopment and another 150 ongoing jobs.

If you want to be able to get the Republicans and Democrats to come to-

gether on a jobs bill, here is a fantastic opportunity, one that will bring in billions of dollars of new revenue from the sale of properties, will cut waste and get rid of a lot of the expense that we have in ongoing properties every year and, ultimately, get Americans back to work. It is truly a bipartisan proposal, something I'm looking forward to seeing on the floor next week.

□ 1230

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2012.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. Since the inauguration of President Alassane Ouattara in May 2011, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people have made significant advances in the promotion of democratic, social, and economic development. Although considerable progress has been made, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures under Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, Blocking Property of Certain Persons Contributing to the Conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 2012.

PRESIDENT'S PRAYER BREAKFAST
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, well, this has been a good day legislatively in the United States House of Representatives, and there are a lot of good things to be said about what's happened today.

Yesterday, there was a wonderful event; it's called the President's Prayer Breakfast here in Washington, and the President was gracious enough—and I'm not being sarcastic. He was gracious enough to once again extend his presence with the First Lady, who is also extremely gracious and represents us well as the Nation's First Lady. It was a marvelous breakfast held north of the Capitol.

There were so many moving, touching things that were said and done, from having an 11-year-old girl that sings like an angel, bless us, and also having an amazing speaker, the author of a book "Amazing Grace," the William Wilberforce story, as well as "Bonhoeffer" from Germany. He was funny, he was inspirational, he was touching.

One of the things that's been such a blessing over the 7 years I've been in Congress has been on Thursday mornings, 8 o'clock to 9 o'clock, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle come together for an hour of sharing breakfast, sharing our Christian faith, listening to prayer requests, praying, singing hymns of faith, and hearing on an alternating basis from Republican and Democrat.

I know people hear what goes on on the floor and assume that Members on one side of the aisle must absolutely hate Members of the other side of the aisle. Actually, there are many of us that get along quite well other than talking about politics. And that's why we protect that hour. We don't talk about politics during that time because those that gather together have something in common, our Christian faith, as well as a heart, wanting to do what's best for this country to ensure that we pass on a better country than we received as stewards.

For the first time in American history, surveys now indicate perhaps 70 percent or more of the American adults believe that we will pass on to our children a country with less opportunity, and our children will have it less well than we have it right now. I'm determined to do everything I can to try to keep that from happening.

But politics doesn't really get into the Thursday morning prayer breakfast where we have our little gathering. It doesn't get into our prayer time where voluntarily Members of Congress come together the first night votes are back. Republicans, Democrats, express personal needs for prayer, and we join hearts and minds together in prayer for

those things of need, as well as those things that we prayed for that result in a rejoicing.

So those kinds of things go on, and I'm very sincere in being grateful to the President for continuing the tradition of appearing at the Presidential prayer breakfast. It is quite meaningful. There are people from over a hundred different countries, and I've talked to so many from so many different countries. I've developed good friends in other countries that they have started prayer breakfasts among their legislators and leaders, and it's wonderful to see that kind of thing going on.

Unfortunately, yesterday, one thing got entered into the prayer breakfast that we, I think, would be better off avoiding, and that is in such a breakfast having someone stand up and basically make it sound as though the programs I'm for are based on Christianity, the inference being, if you oppose me on this, apparently you're not a good Christian.

There's an article that Breeanne Howe posted, yesterday, Thursday, and she starts off with a quote from C.S. Lewis, one of my favorite authors, and the President started with a quote from one of my favorite authors, and the quote is: Christianity has not and does not profess to have a detailed political program. It's meant for all men at all times, and the particular program which suited one place or time would not suit another.

Her article says: This morning, in the middle of his National Prayer Breakfast speech, President Obama delighted those of us who love irony by quoting C.S. Lewis. It was an interesting moment in a speech that put forth the notion that taxing the wealthy is right along in line with the teachings of Jesus.

She says, I mean, Jesus did hang out with tax collectors, right? The idea that government welfare is somehow the fulfillment of Jesus' teaching on charity is a common misconception that many people make, Christians included; and it's the main reason that liberals believe conservatives are Christian hypocrites. Perhaps if the President visited church more often than only during campaign seasons, he might not be so confused.

See, not only do we spend time praising God in church; we also gain insight from pastors who've surely spent more time in the word of God than we have.

And let me insert parenthetically here, I don't hold the failure to attend church against any President because when you look at it, when a President comes to church, if they go to a graduation, they change the whole complexion. They force everyone else there to go through metal detectors and all of this just so one man can come and worship.

So at times it may even be admirable not to go to church and force people to do that. So I don't have a problem with that, although the article goes on and points out other difficulties.

It says: While Obama may have been correct in saying that government mandated shared responsibility, it is equal to the Islamic belief that those of us who've been blessed have an obligation to use those blessings to help others. She says he's incorrect to group in Jesus' teachings "for unto whom much is given, much shall be required;" that is, aside from the fact that Jesus was discussing requirements from God, not the government, he was actually teaching his disciples that they were stewards of God's gift of revelation.

□ 1240

The requirement was to spread the good news of Jesus Christ. It's the crux of Christianity that Obama seems to miss. Jesus came because we were imperfect. We could never fulfill all the requirements that the pharisees loved to lord over the people. Jesus' coming ended the rule of law and began the acceptance that our only way to God was through him. Yes, Jesus very much emphasized the importance of giving to the poor but as a reaction and joy to what we'd been given, not because of a law. Giving out of obligation, she points out, is not truly giving; it's merely following the rules. Just ask anyone who's ever written a check to pay their taxes. I doubt you'll find them excited.

Ms. Howe goes on and says the Bible also teaches that everything we have, including money, belongs to God. We're called to be good stewards with his money. The government is the epitome of mismanaging money. If you truly want to help the poor, you should probably seek out charities, but that would require a bit of work on the part of a giver, and a great many find it easier to just let the government run every aspect of their lives.

So it is that welfare money ends up spitting out of strip club ATMs, and those same people who paid their charity to the government wonder why government hasn't solved this issue. Perhaps they should ask the 27 Democrats who voted against stopping welfare checks from being used at strip clubs, casinos, and liquor stores.

Another highlight in Obama's speech, Ms. Howe points out, was his proud proclamation that his administration has partnered with Catholic charities to help those in poverty. She says: I wonder if these charities are among the ones begging the Obama administration, to no avail, to change the recent Obama edict requiring them to cover both birth control costs in their health care even though it's against their religious beliefs to do so. Really, slapping them across the face would take less time and probably hurt less.

So I again applaud the President for appearing yesterday, and hope that in the future Presidents can avoid references that their agenda is based on Christ's teachings, which would clearly indicate belief that those of us who oppose some aspect of governmental taking and governmental running every-

thing in our lives, that we're the ones who are being non-Christian or being hypocrites, because the fact is, you know, though Jesus did say render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, he also indicated, as his relationship with Zacchaeus would show, that you're supposed to be responsible as members of the government.

Zacchaeus was so excited about having Jesus come that apparently it showed in his life and his exuberance. And not only did his life completely change from having met Jesus, he actually, after Jesus came into his life, decided the appropriate thing for him as a governmental tax collector would be to cut taxes. Not only did he cut taxes, he actually gave a 4 to 1 rebate to those from whom he'd taken too much. So if our government is looking for an example to follow, perhaps doing what Zacchaeus did after he met Jesus would be a good way to go.

Government is supposed to be responsible. Those of us in government do have an obligation as stewards of this country to provide for the common defense and make sure that their own internal financial policies do not bring this Nation down, that we're stewards of this great country so that young people, some of them here, will have a country even better, with more freedoms and more opportunities. And every generation up until now has done that and provided the next generation with more opportunities than they had.

We have a lot of work to do. The reason that I feel so good about today is after 7 years of pushing a bill, a concept, that seems a surprise to Americans when they hear that we haven't dealt with this before, but it is stopping the automatic increases in every Federal department's budget every year. It began in 1974.

Now, I was going about my life. I served in the military for 4 years, practiced law for a number of years, was a judge for a number of years. And I was listening to Rush Limbaugh one day at lunch, and he was talking about the zero baseline budget. And as I listened, I was a person who was shocked. What? Our Federal Government can't balance its budget, and yet it has automatic increases every year in its budgets? That's a no-brainer—just stop the automatic increases. At that time, the Republicans were in the majority. Even though there was a Democratic President, Newt Gingrich and others here showed that if you are persistent and you send the President a balanced budget, he may veto it once, he may veto it twice, but you keep sending him back a balanced budget, eventually you may even get Bill Clinton to sign it because he sees the will of the American people is behind the Congress, not behind a President who's going to keep vetoing a balanced budget. So they finally got a balanced budget signed into law. And they balanced the budget. But they never eliminated the automatic increases.

One of the things that got me to thinking about—probably the main

thing that first started me to thinking about running for Congress was the need to change legislation through which this country since the sixties has provided incentives financially to prevent people from reaching their full potential. So that if a young girl gets bored with high school and she drops out of school and has a baby, instead of having financial incentives—because we know, having the gift of history behind us, we know that if she finishes high school, she will make more during her lifetime than those who don't finish high school. The statistics are so clear. So why wouldn't we want to give her incentives? Despite the hardship of trying to finish school with a child, give her incentives, help her get through high school so she can start reaching her God-given potential. Don't give her incentives to stay out of school and keep having child after child.

I had one woman who had had 15 children, didn't even know where they were, but she had been getting 15 checks. Our government gave her incentives to do that.

Now, it's one thing when people choose a way of life that keeps them from reaching their potential, but it's quite another when we as a Federal Government put in place incentives to keep them from reaching the potential that they have.

And one of the things that hurts so much during a downturn economy for any individual is when they have lost their job and they're used to working because there is fulfillment in working.

Even those of us who believe the Bible's account that there was an Adam and Eve know that before there was a fall from grace when things were perfect, they had a job, and it was to tend the garden. Each individual has the same responsibility. Maybe you're renting. Maybe you're living on somebody else's property. But wherever we are, we have a responsibility to tend that garden. And there's some fulfillment that's innate in mankind that if you have a job and you accomplish things, you have fulfillment, you have self-worth. From that you begin to notice, wow, as C.S. Lewis did, the man the President quoted.

C.S. Lewis noted in his book, "The Case For Christianity," incorporated in the book "Mere Christianity," he talks about how he enjoyed as a professor at Oxford goading Christians. How can there be a good God or a just God when there's so much injustice in the world? Eventually, he got around to realizing that if there were not some standard, unwavering, unequivocal standard of absolute right and wrong in the universe, then how would he know that there was injustice in the world?

□ 1250

In the same manner in which a person who is blind from birth sees nothing but blackness, how could they ever know that there was light and color and beauty with their own eyes? They can't see it.

Lewis explains that he began to realize there has to be something out there, there has to be some entity that has set up justice so I would know right from wrong, I would know injustice from justice.

Yet here we are in the United States Government as Members of Congress, and too often we begin to think not only should we provide for the common defense, not only should we ensure that this government doesn't go broke in providing for the common defense, but we have those who think we should tell everybody how they have to live as a judge in Texas did.

A student may voluntarily want to get up; she is given the right to stand up and give a valedictory address. It may be from her heart, and she wants to thank God; but if she mentions the word "God," "invocation," "benediction," "join in prayer," "bow our heads"—he had a whole list of things—then he will send her to jail because he is going to tell people what they can and cannot say.

During the revolution, one of the most quoted comments that is usually attributed to Voltaire is: "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

It is one of the reasons I was willing to take a scholarship from the United States Army at Texas A&M. It is because I looked forward to 4 years of service and being a part of our Nation's defense, to defend those rights that people are supposed to have—to practice religion, to believe as their heart leads them.

Coming to Congress was quite eye opening. In January of 2005, when I was sworn in, I was surprised with this issue of automatic increases in our Federal appropriation for every Department in the Federal Government automatically increasing. If anyone said let's slow down this rate of increase, then they were portrayed as wanting to hurt people or make draconian cuts when all they were doing was slowing the rate of automatic increase. There were no cuts.

As we have been going through these last 3 years, 4 years of recession, unlike any other recession in our Nation's history because the things that should have gone on have not gone on—I know most of us on this side of the aisle agree it is because the President has hijacked the economy with trillions of dollars in giveaway programs, including to groups like Solyndra. We keep hearing about those more and more. There are more and more hundreds of millions, billions of dollars given to folks because they are pursuing some project that will never make money, but it is something the President wants to promote.

It makes no sense not to stop the automatic increases. I brought it up back in my first Congress as a freshman: Why haven't we stopped the automatic increases in every Department's budget? Make them come in and show us that it is justified to increase their

budget. Don't give them an automatic increase and then only require them to come forward if they want an increase in the increase. Make them come in and justify the increase.

We are going to give our Nation's youth a bankrupted country, for Heaven's sake. Let's at least give them the chance to take over a country where they have freedom from government intrusion into their personal lives and where they have a government that is not bankrupt. We are already saddling them with 10, 20, 30, 40, \$50,000 of debt before they ever arrive in this world. For Heaven's sake, we should be more responsible than that.

What could have been an easier piece of low-hanging fruit to get us on the right track towards being responsible than to say every Federal Department, You come in and justify an increase in your budget, because otherwise you're not getting one; we're just starting where you were last year?

This should have been a no-brainer. It should have been an easy thing to do. I have been here for 7 years and it has not been done. Two of those years we were in the majority, 2005 and 2006. For a year now, we have been back in the majority.

I think most people who follow what happens in Congress know that I have not always been a big supporter of some of the things that our leadership has done. Since I believe in calling things as they are when our leadership has not stood firm and stood for what is right and stood for what we got elected to do, I owe an obligation to Speaker BOEHNER to say thank you. 2005 and 2006 when we were in the majority, neither the budget chairman nor the Speaker were interested in eliminating the automatic increases in every Federal Department's budget.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER assured me last summer that we would get this done. But he said since he is not the Budget Committee chairman, that will be up to Chairman PAUL RYAN to get that done. Well, lucky me, because PAUL RYAN, it turns out, back before I ever got to Congress, had, with our good friend JEB HENSARLING, been pushing an end to the automatic increases in every Federal Department's budget.

Yet even in a Republican majority, before I got to Congress, that bill did not get passed. The automatic increases continued even as people in the United States were struggling. Nobody else has an automatic increase in their family budget every year.

I have discussed this with Chairman PAUL RYAN. He has struggled with this over the years while he was not chairman of the Budget Committee. We should do more oversight over Federal Departments. How are you spending your money? But because we are required to have a budget every year, then the whole year seems to be taken up with getting that budget done and dealing with those budget issues.

He has a solution for that, and that is another bill that I understand will be

forthcoming from the Budget Committee to go to a biennial, a 2-year budget. We will do a budget that will cover 2 years, and that will allow Congress to have hearings and do better oversight.

Before, when Departments wanted an increase in the increase, they had to come up and lobby people on the Hill, say, We need this; we need more money than the automatic increase, and there really wouldn't be time to do proper investigation to see exactly how they were spending their money. A 2-year budget that Chairman RYAN has indicated he would like to see, that would allow them to do the proper oversight.

There are some in the motion to recommit by the Democrats, some of those budgets that I can promise you will be part of some of those programs that virtually every Republican will want to increase. The better way to move forward is to have a budget, no automatic increases, and then have oversight.

□ 1300

Then those Departments, where there will be some part of the Department where we'll want to see an increase, let's look at the areas that need decreasing. Well, when there's an automatic increase every year, then you don't have the opportunity to really go back and visit that; you're worried about doing the budget for the next year.

So I applaud the House for passing the zero-baseline budget bill; and I am very grateful to our leadership, to PAUL RYAN, and the freshman class that has come through that wanted to see this happen.

I filed this bill in each of the four Congresses I've been in. It really takes someone in a committee of jurisdiction shepherding that through. So my language was incorporated into a bill that our freshman Representative WOODALL put together. As a member of the Budget Committee, he did an excellent job of marshaling that through, handling things here on the floor, and even dealing with the debates.

I think it's important to note we've had friends across the aisle stand up and argue against passage of a zero-baseline budget yesterday and today. One of the more articulate people in the House is CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and when we disagree, I still admire his ability to put words together in such an adept fashion. I have his exact words in his argument against passage of a bill that ends the automatic increases every year. My friend across the aisle, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, said: "This bill, when you pass it, doesn't save one penny." He goes on to talk about how we can cut them if we really want to cut them, but he goes on and he says: "So, again, this bill doesn't save a penny." He finishes his comments in saying: "But this bill doesn't mandate any kind of cutting of that nature."

So I was interested when our colleague across the aisle, Representative

DELAURO, came to the floor because she stated, in arguing against the zero-baseline budget, she said: "At its heart, this bill is a back-door attempt to enact the same radical cuts the majority attempted last year and to further reduce the spending caps agreed to in the last August Budget Control Act."

She said: "By eliminating inflation from our official budget considerations, this bill represents a freeze on all discretionary programs that over time would become a devastating cut to critical programs." She said: "Within 10 years, all discretionary programs would see their funding slashed by as much as 20 percent," and she references this dangerous cut.

So we have one of our very able colleagues across the aisle saying this doesn't save one penny, and another colleague across the aisle standing up and saying this represents radical cuts. Well, what it should do and what it does do is eliminate the automatic increases that no family in America, no business in America has. All of the surveys indicate Federal employees are being paid better than the private sector. Why shouldn't we take a better, closer look in each Congress as to which Department needs increase and which needs decrease, and what parts of each Department should be lowered and which should be raised. That is the responsible thing to do.

I think Chairman RYAN's proposal to a 2-year budget, though I had never thought about it before talking with him—2-year budgets are what we have in Texas so that you have some planning and you have something to count on. I think it also indicates for this country what we see over and over, the private sector says if you could give us some continuity where we know the same laws will be utilized for at least some period of time, then we've got something to count on and we'll invest our capital.

Whether they're Democrat or Republican business folks, or like on Wall Street where they're four-to-one Democrat over Republican, they still get it; and they will see, gee, we've got some continuity here so that we shouldn't be afraid to invest capital and get the economy going. But as the old saying goes, capital is a coward; it goes to areas where it feels safest and it never feels safe when things are constantly in flux. This way there will be more continuity, and we'll know more of what to expect.

Last year, CBO—and that's the Congressional Budget Office. It has rather interesting rules. I think when you look at the history of CBO's projections of the costs of things and how revenue would go, it makes it pretty clear. If we were in the private sector, we would have gotten rid of CBO a long time ago and gotten somebody that is far more accurate at projections.

I know that CBO previously, when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker, HARRY REID is head of the Senate, they were pushing the ObamaCare bill. It was

scored, and CBO scored it over \$1 trillion. Then the Director got called over to the White House for a little woodshedding, although Director Elmendorf has told me he wasn't woodshedded, that he just had a nice conversation with the President. But after whatever you want to call it, his visit to the White House, he went back and cut off a quarter of a trillion dollars from their estimate basically and said, well, it's more like around \$800 billion is the projected cost.

Well, some of us weren't terribly surprised after it passed that CBO then came back and said, even though the President said it would cost less than \$1 trillion and we had projected it would cost more than \$1 trillion, and then the President asked us to lower it and we took a new look and we lowered it to around \$800 billion, now that it has passed—after the President promised everybody it would cost less than \$1 trillion—now it's passed and we look at it and you know what, it's really over \$1 trillion that it will cost us.

So if we want to keep faith in CBO and really figure out how much we can trust them, then maybe that is a good indication, that any projection from CBO should be looked at with a factor of plus or minus 25 percent. They give us a projection, but they may be off by 25 percent too low, they may be off 25 percent too high. So really you have about a 50 percent chance of the CBO just really missing their mark.

If we were in the private sector trying to balance budgets, unless you get government bailouts, you wouldn't allow anything to get money, your hard-earned money, that doesn't come closer than a plus or minus 25 percent rate of failure. A plus or minus 25 percent margin of error for any government entity should require us to get rid of it and figure out new rules for scoring bills and develop an entity, even if it's in the private sector where they do a far better job—certain people, some are terrible and that's why they go broke, but some are quite good and a whole lot better than a 25 percent plus or minus margin of error.

Now, some have said, well, this is going nowhere in the Senate. We've cut out the automatic increase in the House; but as everybody knows, it's got to pass the Senate, and then you've got to get the President to sign it. Well, this is an election year. It's amazing sometimes what people will do in an election year, because they know the people expect it, that they might not do in a non-election year. We're told there may be 20 or so Senate seats that could possibly go either way.

So I would hope that as my friends at FreedomWorks, Heritage Action, other places, as they start putting the heat on the Senate to be responsible—no more automatic increases in every Department's budget, by golly. You need to take a look at those budgets before you increase it one penny, see if it needs to be cut, see if it needs to be increased.

□ 1310

That pressure starts being brought to bear on the Senate. I would hope that the Republican leader would make clear in writing to the majority leader, HARRY REID, that we have at least 47 people ready to vote on this bill; and then the pressure goes on the Democrats who are in tough election cycles. Well, are you going to be supporting these automatic increases? And are you going to stand with HARRY REID and prevent this from coming to the floor of the Senate to make us more responsible as a government and force us to look at each Department and determine whether they needed an increase or not? Or are you just going to go along with the same old automatic extra spending every year, like no other American can do?

I have that hope that springs eternal in the human breast, and I hope I keep it until the day I die. But I believe we have a real opportunity to get it through the Senate, to have at least 60 Senators do the responsible thing in a bipartisan way, follow the lead of the House, which couldn't have been done without all these wonderful fresh faces, like Representative WOODALL. Follow the lead of the freshmen who have now, for the first time in all these years, said, you know what, no more automatic increases.

I think it's a harbinger of good things to come. I'm greatly encouraged as we start—at least early in this year—with such a great bill. And I don't know how long the wonderful people of east Texas, who I love with all my heart, and I want to live around all of my life—I don't know how long they'll allow me the honor of representing them here. But I think there is also a message here. It may take 7 years to keep pounding on an issue. But when it's the right thing to do, when people are struggling across America to pay their bills and they've had no automatic increases—in fact, I've talked to people and they indicate—they're Democrats—and they say, Please help us. We're having such a tough time. We've just been cut in our pay. So could you cut us a little slack from Washington?

We owe it to those people to quit spending so much so they can have even a little more of their budget. And I would think, as the President has talked about, people paying their fair share, we should take him at his word and ram through a flat tax that says, if you're rich, you pay more because you're making more. And a flat tax does that. And if you are poor, you're not making as much as others, you pay less.

And in the discussion with Steve Forbes, who ran for President on the idea of a flat tax, talking to Steve last week, I was asking him about some of the nuances of his plan. But he said under his flat tax proposal, if you were a family of four, he provided a \$46,000 exemption. So if you make less than that as a family of four, you don't pay

any tax. So it's kind of hard to say that you're going after the poor in American society.

A flat tax would eliminate the games. It would allow everyone to pay according to what they receive. That way, to whom much is given, more would be required, as the President quoted yesterday. And for those who are given less, less is required. That would be the way to go.

Let's cut the automatic expenditures. Let's be more responsible as a Congress in supervising those things. As the Oversight Committee, oversight hearings progress, move forward, we'll show responsibility in doing that; and the American people will be the beneficiary. And I hope and pray that within the next few years, the polls and surveys will turn around that will show the American public we can get this thing back under control so that it can go on for another 200 years. We can do that. And then we'll see the surveys turn around so they don't say 70 percent of American adults don't think we're going to leave our children as good a country as we got it.

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

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas who spoke so eloquently about the condition of the country and the condition it's left in. I want to remind the American people that one of the obstacles we still have to overcome is that we have a health care plan that was passed out of the last Congress that isn't in full effect yet, but we're starting to feel the problems with it.

What I'm referring to is, of course, what everyone else calls the ObamaCare legislation, passed 2½ years ago now, not fully implemented until after this next election, but influencing Americans in their daily lives. Now, the majority of Americans don't agree with the plan. A majority of Americans don't want the plan, but we still have it.

Interestingly, about a third of Americans think we don't have it anymore, that when the House passed their repeal last year in January—one of the very first actions we took in the new House—they thought we were done with it, that America could wash its hands of it. But, in fact, the repeal bill was sent to the Senate where, as many other bills coming out of the House last year, it suffered the same fate. It sits in the Senate without the Senate taking action to do what the American

people want, which is to repeal ObamaCare.

America understands that that bill has many, many problems, some of which we'll talk about in the next few minutes, just to remind Americans this is still there. It's still causing problems.

The gentleman from Texas spoke about the problems with our economy. As I go through the district I represent, I talk to businessmen and -women every week; and they tell me the same thing: they're worried about the economy. They're worried about government regulation. They're worried about health care insurance for their employees because they're worried about what the effect of ObamaCare is. And as this shows, 74 percent of American businesses surveyed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce say: The recent health care law—that's ObamaCare—makes it harder for their businesses to hire more employees.

The bottom line is they don't know what the rules are. The rules are changing. As we know, 1,700 businesses and unions have to get waivers from that bill in order to keep their health care going this year. And of course those waivers will disappear in a year, and businesses don't know what's going to happen once those waivers expire.

A real life example: a furniture business owner in the Fifth District of Texas, this is what he said: I could start two companies and hire multiple people; but based on this administration and the lack of facts with ObamaCare, I will continue to sit and wait.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, America knows that you can't possibly make another empty government promise to ensure 14 million additional Americans while you are going to save money, increase access, and increase quality. Americans have figured this out a long time ago. You can't get all those things. And they know and they suspect what's going to happen is what will happen: the quality will go down, and the amount of money spent on other health care programs by the government will go down.

What's the other major health care program paid for by the government? Medicare. The ObamaCare bill takes \$500 billion out of Medicare over the next 10 years. Most worrisome is how it takes that \$500 billion out of Medicare. It sets up what's called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Now, every American ought to be familiar with those terms because this is what's going to control your health care when you get old or your parent gets old or a loved one you know enters Medicare.

□ 1320

These 15 bureaucrats, chosen by the President, not accountable to anyone, with no appeal of their decision, will decide what gets covered and what doesn't get covered in Medicare when the government runs short of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you read the same headlines I do. The government's \$15.2 trillion short of money, with no end in sight. The President's last budget, submitted to Congress a year ago—we're waiting to see the budget he's supposed to submit next week, which we understand will be a week or two late—that budget never balanced.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that luxury in my household. I actually have to make a budget balance. And Mr. Speaker, I would never make a financial move that I knew was passing along a debt to my children and my family. I wouldn't go out, buy a big house, buy a big car, take an expensive vacation, put it on a credit card that I knew my children are going to have to pay.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the President's budget and ObamaCare does. It takes the big government credit card, which is already past its credit limit, \$15.2 trillion, runs it through the swiper one more time and says, we're going to insure 14 million more people. But don't worry, the cost will go down, the access will go up, and the quality will go up. Americans just don't believe it, and they have a right not to believe it.

This 15-member board, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB is what we call it around here. What you ought to call it is the Voucher Rationing Panel.

Mr. Speaker, what they are are 15 bureaucrats, specifically excluding someone who practices medicine from participating in the decisions of what Medicare is going to cover and not cover if and when the government runs out of money. But we know the government's going to run out of money. We know Medicare's going to exceed its budget. It does every year.

But if that were all that was bad in the bill, we might be able to just repeal that and move on. But it's not. We saw earlier there were provisions on small businesses called the 1099 provision, making small businesses do tens of billions of dollars worth of paperwork so that the government can collect a few billion dollars more in taxes, meanwhile, strangling small businesses. This Congress was smart enough to repeal that aspect.

Just last week we repealed another aspect of the bill. It was called, strangely enough, the CLASS Act. Now, what this act did is, this was long-term care insurance under the Medicare provisions that starts collecting the premiums now, but doesn't provide services until the future, meanwhile, spending those premiums on other expenses in the government.

Sound familiar? Sound like what's happening to your Social Security dollars and your Medicare employment taxes now, your payroll taxes? That's exactly what this was. Set up what even Democrats called, in the Senate, a Ponzi scheme that would make Bernie Madoff proud. So we repealed it.

But last week, in perhaps one of the worst parts of the bill, which really

had nothing to do with money, was when the Secretary of Health held that religious institutions had to provide care under their insurance policies that was not consistent with their religious beliefs. That is, sterilization, contraception, and abortion. Full coverage, no deductible, zero deductible, putting it in the same category as breast cancer, prostate cancer, lung cancer, colon cancer, the other measures that were meant to be covered by that clause in ObamaCare, the preventive care clause.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that assumes, if you want to prevent illness, that pregnancy is a disease. Or pregnancy is an illness. What a long way we have come from when society felt that pregnancy was something to be celebrated, it was an extension of life, it was an extension of society, the next generation.

The Secretary of, and I put it in quotes, "Health" in this administration, has decided that pregnancy is a disease or illness that needs to be prevented. That's not a good recipe for the future of our society or this country. And worst of all, it's a stark violation of the First Amendment of the United States that the government shall not compel anyone to go against their religious principles.

They'll tell you there's an exemption, but there isn't. Yes, if you're a church, you're the church itself, you are. But God forbid that church goes into the community and runs a center for social justice, a center for adoption, a hospital. That religious institution running that other entity would be forced to provide coverage for something that is antithetical to the religious beliefs of that religion.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is just wrong. It's bad policy, and it violates the First Amendment of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire, how much more time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 7 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. So let's walk through some of this.

Why do we need to repeal this bill?

The bottom line is there is so much wrong with this bill, a bill that not only will cut \$500 billion from current Medicare recipients, because you'll hear a lot of talk about, oh, that Ryan bill, it destroyed Medicare as we know it. Well, they forget to tell you that it doesn't touch Medicare for people over the age of 55. In fact, we restore that \$500 billion for people who are currently covered or for people who are 55 and older who will be entering Medicare in the next 10 years.

The little secret of ObamaCare is it takes current Medicare and cuts it by \$500 billion. Now, my mother's 88 years old. I don't want a board of bureaucrats in Washington making a life-or-death decision on whether she gets Medicare treatment paid for—by 15 bureaucrats sitting in Washington who never met her. I think that decision ought to be made by my mother and her health care providers. No government bureau-

crat in the room, no appointed bureaucrat with no appeals process who can say no, we don't really know your specific situation, but you know what? This is what it sounds like to us, and we think that shouldn't be covered, so you're not getting that care covered.

And ladies and gentleman, you know, with the cost of medical care, if the government says it's not covering it, it's not getting done. Is that the way we want health care delivered in the United States? Is that what we want?

Do we want a bill that says what kind of care you're going to receive, even if you're not on Medicare, that you have to go into specific health care plans, your employer is shoehorned into them? That promise—don't worry, if you like your plan, you'll keep it—had to have 1,700 waivers in the first year alone, 1,700 waivers. That's not the kind of health care we need. That's not the kind of health care plan we need.

Do we want a plan that can be taken to the extreme by the Secretary of Health to say that we're going to violate closely, deeply held religious principles in certain religions in the United States, and we're going to force those people to do things against their religion? Is that what we've come down to?

So, ladies and gentlemen, the cure is simple. We need to simply repeal ObamaCare. There is too much wrong with it. We tried to fix it piece by piece. We tried to pull out the things that hurt small business. We tried to deal with why you need 1,700 waivers. We tried to deal with that long-term care coverage. I'm convinced that bill will go to the Senate and it will die. We'll have instituted yet another Ponzi scheme in the United States.

And those are not words from this side of the aisle. Those are the words of a Democrat Senator describing that long-term care plan that was part of ObamaCare, the one that takes your dollars, your dollars that you will put in it now, spends it now, with a promise, don't worry, when you get old and need it, there will be some money there.

Ladies and gentlemen, we've heard that before. That dog don't hunt anymore. We've heard it with Medicare. We've heard it with Social Security. Americans have realized this Congress has spent us into bankruptcy with promises like that in the past. If we have made those promises in the past, we have to keep the promises we've made.

But ladies and gentlemen, we have not implemented ObamaCare in its fullest, and now is the time to repeal it before we begin that. So, ladies and gentlemen, that's why over the next few weeks you'll hear, and Mr. Speaker, we'll see things come to the floor that deal with it, like we did last week and repealed that long-term care act that a Democrat Senator called a Ponzi scheme that Bernie Madoff would be proud of. A Ponzi scheme that Bernie Madoff would be proud of. That's why

congressional approval rating is at 9 percent, because America watches as we come down to Washington and create Ponzi schemes.

It's just time to stop. It's time for common sense to prevail. Common sense is we have to stop spending more money than we have. We have to stop burdening the hardworking taxpayers of America. We have to balance our budget. We have to pass a balanced budget amendment so that future Congresses can't create more Ponzi schemes.

□ 1330

We have to deal with the debt and the deficit. Are they hard decisions? They certainly are. Are they decisions the American public expects us to come together and make? They certainly do. Let's rise to the occasion. I join with the President, who, a week ago, says let's work together to solve these problems.

Mr. President, you don't solve these problems by impeding people's First Amendment rights to freedom of religion. You don't solve these problems by proposing \$300 billion new stimulus spending in your State of the Union speech. You don't solve these problems by going out and doubling down on Solyndra. You don't solve these problems by denying the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. President, we're ready. Let's come together and solve America's problems.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

JOB CREATION

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, preliminarily, I'm here to discuss today's very encouraging jobs report.

I am struck. The previous speaker said he would never engage in expenditures on a credit card when we were already deeply in debt on behalf of his family. I note that he was not a Member of the Congress when this Congress voted to go to war in Iraq, for example, and also in Afghanistan. I voted for the war in Afghanistan. I thought the war in Iraq was a terrible mistake and still do.

All of us who voted to go to war in Afghanistan were voting to go into further debt. War is very expensive. We don't want to send our young people into battle—and some of our middle-aged people—without the best possible equipment. So I thought we had to go to war in Afghanistan in self-defense.

I thought the war in Iraq was a terrible error. The majority of my colleagues, including virtually every Republican, voted to do that.

So this principle that you don't vote to spend money when you don't have it is apparently, for some, a fairly flexible one. In fact, not only did the majority at that time under President Bush vote to go into two wars, they did it while voting for several large tax cuts. So they were exacerbating that very difficulty.

As I said, I voted to go to war in Afghanistan. I was prepared to vote for some revenues to pay for it.

Mostly, though, I want to talk today about the very encouraging report we got today about the economy.

We are in the early stages of recovery. It's not going nearly fast enough. What is now clear is that the recession that President Obama inherited from the previous administration in 2009 when he took office was deeper than people realized at the time. It was clearly the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression; and, in many ways, it was more disabling in the sense of the interconnections, although overall it was not.

President Obama and others underestimated the depths of that recession. Many of us did. So the recovery has been slower than it should have been in the interests of the American people.

But the fact is, very clearly, it is underway. I want to talk about that, and I want to talk about what's retarding it.

One of the interesting things today was the jobs number: 257,000 private sector jobs created, a very significant number. Enough, if it is a pattern, that can continuously cut into the unemployment figure. But it was accompanied by a 14,000 job reduction in public sector employment; and that, unfortunately, is a pattern.

If you go back to the worst of the recession, the end of 2009—remember President Obama comes in in early 2009. We did pass an economic recovery package which clearly, by virtually every economist's acknowledgment, improved the situation. It didn't cure it. It didn't do as much to reduce the rate as had been hoped because the deficit in the economy was deeper.

But since that end of 2009 when things began to turn around after we had passed an economic recovery program that began to help, after a Federal Reserve under a Bush appointee, Ben Bernanke, reappointed by President Obama, continued its stimulative efforts, here's what happened basically since the last months of 2009 and the beginning of 2010:

We have had, in this economy, in the 2-year period, the creation in the private sector of 3.663 million jobs, approximately. You can't be exact. But over 3.6 million jobs. Unfortunately, during the same time period, a couple months earlier, public sector employment has declined by more than 550,000 jobs. In other words, if the public sector had simply been allowed to stay even, if there hadn't been firings of firefighters and people who shovel the snow and clean the streets and main-

tain the parks and teach young people and preserve law and order, if we hadn't fired police officers, public works employees, municipal engineers, teachers, sanitary workers, if we hadn't required them to be fired by a perverse set of Federal budget policies that had that negative impact on the municipalities, we would have had a half a million more jobs.

I'm not talking about the public sector increasing. If the public sector had simply been allowed to stay even, if this Congress had not sent money to build Afghanistan—futilely, in my judgment—if it hadn't wasted money on a war in Iraq that never should have begun and kept that money home and we could have had more police officers and firefighters and teachers and public works employees working here in our country, then the unemployment rate would be below 8 percent today.

This is exactly the opposite of what my Republican colleagues claim. Oh, the public sector, they say, is strangling the private sector. No. The truth is exactly the opposite. The private sector has increased, not yet at the rate we had hoped; although, if the private sector can continue to add 250,000-plus jobs a month, then we will. That's 3 million jobs a year. That will substantially reduce unemployment to the point which is where we should be, if we can persuade our Republican colleagues to stop forcing the cities and counties and States to lay off important public employees.

I got an anguished letter the other day from the mayor of the City of Fall River, Massachusetts, about a great addiction program, the Stanley Street treatment program, in his town. He wanted to know why they were cut off from the \$1.4 million they had gotten to deal with addiction. The answer is this Congress voted out the whole program. I couldn't be their advocate and say, look, this is a good program, give them money because I was told by the agency about, you know, We know it's a good program. You Give us money. We can't give out money when you voted against it.

That money is in Kandahar. That money is in Basra. If it were doing any good over there, I would feel better about it. But we are spending money futilely overseas in wars, one of which shouldn't have started and one of which should have started—and, by the way, should end.

By the way, I heard my colleague, the previous speaker, talk about spending too much. In fact, one of the major criticisms the Republican Party now has, certainly their Presidential candidates and many here in the Congress, is not that the President is spending too much but that he is spending too little. They've criticized him for withdrawing our troops from Iraq, even though it was on a timetable President Bush had set forward. They want more troops in Iraq. Nothing is more expensive than keeping troops in a near combat situation; and that's right, because

you don't send people into combat without doing everything you can to protect them.

There are people who are criticizing the decision of beginning to reduce the troops in Afghanistan. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan at their height were costing \$150 billion a year over and above the regular military budget. I cannot think of anything less consistent than to argue that, a, we should be reducing the deficit and, b, we should be continuing to spend money not just on military activity but on nation building in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Let's go back to the job situation. There were 3.6 million private sector jobs created in 2 years.

By the way, that has been reflected in the economy.

□ 1340

On March 9, 2009, then-Speaker PELOSI, Mr. Speaker, convened a meeting in which we talked about things we thought we should do for the financial sector. It was the beginning of our efforts to do financial reform.

I know the Republicans think that financial reform is a terrible idea; that, apparently, we should have derivatives unregulated. We shouldn't have an independent consumer bureau.

We should continue the practice whereby people can make loans to people who shouldn't get them and then sell those loans to other people so they had no interest in whether or not they were repaid. Because we began our financial reform efforts in March of 2009, and we were told it was terrible for the financial industry.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average on March 9 was 6,500. By March 9, now 3 years later, it will very likely be double what it was then. The Dow Jones Industrial Average will have doubled in the aftermath of the passage of the economic Recovery Act, the financial reform bill, even the health bill.

Maybe I don't claim that we did it, but we certainly didn't retard it. So in that time period, 3.6 million jobs were created. At the end of the Bush administration, of course, we were into very substantial job loss. In the very first months of the Obama administration and the last months of the Bush administration, job losses in the hundreds of thousands a month. Now we have begun to turn that around.

And again, let's stress if it hadn't been for Federal budget policies forced by this Congress and by others in the Congress who were reluctant to do the right thing, if States and cities had simply been allowed to keep their current level, in other words, if we had had increases in the private sector and held steady over a 3-year period in the public sector, we'd have half a million more jobs in America today and probably more because these things have some multiplier effect.

And clearly unemployment would be below 8 percent. It has dropped to 8.3. By the way, when unemployment went down to 8.9 and 8.7, the critics of the

President said, oh, that's just because the labor force has dropped. Well, the labor force went up in this past month, according to the statistics.

More people were encouraged to look for jobs. And with more people looking for jobs, we still had a drop to 8.3 percent in the unemployment numbers.

Now, that is an example of the wrong-headedness of the very conservative approach of the economy. Yes, we have a deficit. It is a very large deficit, much of it incurred because of the policies of President Bush supported by Republican majorities in Congress. I'm told I didn't read it, but the bill we passed yesterday said that the tax cuts under George Bush did not add to the deficit.

That is Marxist reasoning, Chico Marxist reasoning. It reminds me of the time in one of the movies where Groucho caught Chico red-handed and Chico, denying that he had done it, said, Who are you going to believe, me or your own eyes?

Bills that passed cut government revenues by hundreds of billions of dollars, and it didn't add to the deficit. Of course it did and it added to the deficits at the same time we were incurring further deficits by going to war. I didn't vote for the war in Iraq. I voted for the war in Afghanistan, but I have for some time now thought we should withdraw entirely.

It is the Republicans at the Presidential level and in the Congress who are resisting that we spend more.

We have begun to reduce defense spending. The President made a very radical decision. He said that after the late forties when we sent troops to Western Europe and Central Europe to keep Joe Stalin, a vicious, brutal murderer from invading central and Western Europe—countries that had been left devastated by World War II—that having done that in 1948 and '49, it was time to withdraw them.

Well, according to my Republican friends, that's a terrible mistake. They want to keep those troops in Western Europe. That would be good for the economies of Europe, and they need them these days, but it's terrible for the United States. The heads of the military said, you know what, we can take these troops out of Europe and retire them.

That doesn't mean you fire them. I was glad to see General Odierno say we will not dismiss anyone who signed up to serve this country. We are grateful for them, and they should be allowed to serve out fully what they did and get the full veterans benefit that a grateful Nation owes them. But with the turnover in the military in ordinary circumstances, you can reach a reduction fairly soon by simply not hiring new people.

Now, I will add that there is another great inconsistency on my Republican colleagues' point. When I debate with them whether or not we should cut spending for firefighters or public-works employees, whether we should

provide money to build highways, whether we should do things where the Federal Government provides funds that I believe are job creating, they tell me you can look it up in all of the debates that we've had here, that government spending doesn't create jobs.

They deny that the government spending money can create jobs, with one wonderful exception. Apparently that doesn't apply to military spending because when it comes to reducing military spending, they have all become the most devoted followers of John Maynard Keynes. They sound like the New Dealers at their most urgent and ardent.

The military to them is the world's great public works project. Obviously, it has other functions; but when we talk about reducing the military, all of a sudden government spending is a great fount of job creation. Well, the fact is that when you reduce military spending, you can cut back on jobs in the near term as you can in other areas.

I do believe that cutting military spending can result in less job reduction than, for instance, cutting the right kind of medical spending. Yes, we should have comparisons of this, but I'm talking now just about the sheer hypocrisy of arguing that government spending cannot create jobs and then turning around and invoking government spending as a part of the military.

In fact, as these numbers show, our having four States and cities to cut back—and by the way the reason States and cities have cut back is not simply that we haven't given them Federal funds, which I believe in a proper approach of this system we should. That was the radical program of revenue sharing, it was called, in Community Development Block Grants, which was first put forward by that—I never thought terribly radical—Richard Nixon in the seventies.

But the fact is that the national economic crisis has hit with particular impact on cities and States, especially since it manifests itself in low-housing prices. Of all the levels of government in this country—local, State and Federal—it's the local governments that rely most heavily on the property tax.

So when property is devalued, as it has been by factors far beyond the control of any city, the city's revenues suffer. And so it's a combination of their natural revenue base suffering as a national policy because of the denial of funding on programs that have existed since Richard Nixon, that they have had to lay off over half a million people.

And because they've laid off half a million people, instead of there being a net 3.6 million increase in jobs in the last couple of years, it's 3.1 million. And 550,000 jobs would be better than 3 percent on the unemployment figures. It would reduce unemployment. And here is, of course, the great mistake the conservative ideology makes and you're seeing it in Europe as well.

By the way, I don't think it's an accident that in America President Obama has resisted this notion that we should make even further and further cuts domestically. I do acknowledge that my colleagues are big spenders when it comes to Iraq, Afghanistan, bases in Europe and other military expenditures, much less useful, I think, for our economy.

But in Europe, they have been falling on recently the notion of austerity. As today's numbers make clear, we have a way to go in our economy, and we need to work to cooperate to keep this economic recovery going and get it more vigorous. Of all the major developed economies in the world, the American economy is doing the best. Obviously, the developing ones—India, China—starting from a lower base, they are doing better. But if you look at the major industrialized Nation, we are doing better because we have resisted a sense of austerity.

Now, sometimes intelligence requires an ability to make distinctions that are beyond some people. Yes, we have a deficit, and we have to reduce the deficit. But at the same time, we have a serious unemployment problem which is getting less serious. It's still serious, but 8.3 percent is better than 8.9 percent or 9.1 percent. And 7.9 percent would have been even better if they hadn't forced cities and States to lay off cops and public-works employers and teachers and firefighters.

But what we need to be able to do is to work on both of these. In the near term, some stimulative activity to deal with the unemployment situation is a good thing. This is not a time to choke off this recovery. But precisely because we are in the early stages of recovery, we can, if we do the right thing in the near term, begin with the end of this current year, start cutting back on the deficit.

Now, it's interesting, by the way, that one of the ways you do that will be to continue to reduce military spending, along with other things. But what do my Republican colleagues say? Oh, no, you can't reduce another penny of military spending.

One of the things I've been told, by the way, is that we've hollowed out the military in past years. I wrote to Secretary of Defense Panetta who, to my surprise, claimed that after the end of the Cold War we had hollowed out the military. I was surprised because Leon Panetta was the Budget Director during that period after the Cold War under Clinton. So, apparently, this was a confession that he himself had hollowed out the military, but I don't think we did.

□ 1350

And I have written him and I have asked others, would anyone please come forward and say on this floor of the House, or elsewhere, given the argument that we've hollowed out the military, can anyone show me one example of where, in the period after the

demise of the Soviet Union, one of the great things that happened for human history, we needed to apply military force and didn't have it?

President Clinton didn't lack for the appropriate force in southern Yugoslavia to accomplish his goals. George Bush, in the immediate end of the Cold War, was able to do Iraq, the first President Bush. The second President Bush had too much military from my standpoint in terms of what he used in going to war in Iraq and Afghanistan at the same time.

So this argument that we've hollowed out the military is nonsense. With the reductions that are planned, we will still be, by far, the strongest military in the world and well able to defend ourselves.

And yes, if we're going to reduce the deficit, we have to put cuts in a lot of places. We can cut the Social Security that goes to wealthy people. I receive Social Security. I'm prepared to vote to have it all taxed away. That's an effective way to means test it, not by a complicated process at the outset. For those of us who make a certain income and we're getting Social Security, give us a 95 percent tax. That will work very efficiently.

I'm prepared to put some constraints on spending domestically on programs I like. But exempting the military, as my Republican colleagues want, trying to scare the American people by saying that if we're only five times as strong as our nearest adversary we'll somehow be in danger, that isn't remotely the case. Continuing to maintain a full complement of weaponry to defeat the Soviet Union in a cold war when it has long since imploded, none of those make sense.

But here's the point. If we commit ourselves to longer-term deficit reduction, then we can, without in any way causing any loss of confidence, do the short-term spending that will help us. And, by the way, the other area where we should be working to reduce the deficit is in taxation.

One of the controversies we have now is our proposal that many of us support to put a surtax on income for people who earn more than \$1 million a year. It's called the millionaire's tax. That's a misleading name. You can have \$10 million in your estate, in your accounts, and still not be earning \$1 million a year. We're not talking about people who have a million or 2 or 3 or 4. We're talking about people who earn \$1 million a year in taxable income every year.

What we've said is every time you earn more than \$1 million a year, for every thousand in taxable income, after all of your deductions that you earned, we're going to tax you \$56; \$56 per thousand for people who are already earning \$1 million. It's nonsense to suggest that would in any way be disturbing to them or to their spending patterns; but it would help us reduce the deficit.

So yeah, I want to shore up Medicare. I was struck that the previous speaker

had two complaints about the President: one, that he's spending too much money, and, two, that he's not spending enough. He complained about cuts in Medicare. In fact, those are not cuts that went to any beneficiary or even to the actual providers in the real sense. They went to some insurance companies that were getting more than they needed.

But if we will include the military and put constraints elsewhere and ask the wealthiest people in this country to pay some taxes—and, by the way, this argument that tax increases kill the economy, the last time I heard it was when President Clinton asked Congress to raise taxes on incomes above \$150,000, a far lower figure than we're talking about today, even correcting for inflation. He said raise the tax on people making \$150,000, put the top rate from 36 to 39.6 percent, a fairly small increase I thought at the time. And we did it, over the objection of the right-wing economists, and they told us it would be the end of the economy. In fact, subsequent to that, in the many years after that, we had one of the best economic performances of American history, not necessarily because we raised taxes, but even though we did.

The fact is that people who thought these arguments, they greatly exaggerate the sensitivity of this vast, complex, strong American economy to fairly small changes in tax rates. But the point is that we have been told before that increasing by a fairly small amount of taxes on the very wealthy—and as I said, we were talking then about 150; we're talking about a much higher figure today—that's a way to help reduce the deficit.

Constraining the military helps reduce the deficit, and that brings me back to the point of these job numbers. Totally contrary to what the Republican Presidential candidates are saying when they take time out from saying terrible things about each other—but I will give them credit, as I listen to the Republican candidates make the most devastating, negative, personal attacks on each other, I do have to concede that they are almost always right in what they say about each other. But when they lay off each other, they make extraordinarily negative, excessively denigrating comments about our country, talking about how this country is no longer respected in the world, directly contrary to all of the evidence, denigrating our economy when we are, today, the best performing major developed economy in the world. Still not good enough, but it would be better still if the Republicans would cooperate with us instead of trying to make things worse.

250,000 new private sector jobs, including increases in manufacturing. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, a significant part of that was because the government intervened, over the objection of the Republicans now running for President and many in Congress, to help the automobile industry.

Let me read from yesterday's New York Times. The headline: In a Surprise, Car Sales Start New Year Strongly. And it says that American and other automobile dealers are doing very well. And then:

Chrysler ends quarter with \$225 million profit. The comeback from bankruptcy at Chrysler hit a milestone when the company reported its first full year of positive earnings since 2005. And it says:

This was a company that just 3 years ago needed a government bailout and a trip through bankruptcy to survive.

The fact is that the intervention, initiated by President Obama and supported by this Congress, particularly our Democratic Members, with some Republicans but with most of them opposing it, rescued General Motors and Chrysler. General Motors is today the number one automobile company in the world. It wouldn't have been if we'd listened to the Republicans.

Manufacturing employment has begun to increase, partly because we've gotten these jobs back at Chrysler and General Motors.

And, by the way, among those that were strongly supportive of the intervention was Ford. Ford had been prudent, had borrowed some money or had mortgaged itself and had some cash. They didn't need a direct participation in the funds that came from the TARP. That hated TARP. But they strongly supported it because they knew if General Motors and Chrysler weren't able to continue to function, the supply chain in America would dry up. That would have cost more jobs, and it would have put Ford at a disadvantage.

So we have a thriving American automobile industry today that's on the upswing that we wouldn't have had if we listened to the Republican argument that government always is bad. Oh, I make an exception: Government is always bad unless it's the military. They impute to the military powers beyond what it has, it seems to me.

I would make the point that our military is a superb instrument, full of extraordinary people, and they are very good at doing what a military should do—stopping bad things from happening. It is not fair to them and unrealistic to expect them to be able to make good things happen. Yes, they can stop murderers. But the best armed, the most thoughtful young Americans ever assembled aren't going to be able to get the Shia and Sunni and the Kurds to like each other; or to bring to Afghanistan what it's never been able to get, sadly. I wish we could, but we don't do it with American firepower.

But with the exception of the military, we hear only negatives about government. In fact, we have a private sector that has begun to connect. We are now at a pace to reduce unemployment to a reasonable level. If it hadn't been for the job reductions in the public sector, forced by many here, we would be even better off. And, by the way, we

are talking about people who provide services essential to the quality of life, people who pave the streets and shovel the snow and deal with the sewage and clean up the parks and police and fire. These are essential people. We have half a million less of these people. We're not talking about Federal bureaucrats here. These job losses are mostly at the State and local levels. We have half a million less of them.

We have, fortunately, 3.6 million more private employees in this period of recovery from the recession. If we had been able to maintain the public sector, we would be lower in unemployment. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will look at this, that they will stop this mindless, partisanly motivated trashing of America when we are doing better than any other developed economy of any size, even though we are held back to some extent by them, that they will instead join with us in saying, look, let's understand that we need spending constraints across the board, including the military; that the wealthiest people in this country, the people running hedge funds can afford to pay a regular tax and not get that carried interest boondoggle that is in no way an incentive to economic activity but simply makes them richer. I understand why they'd rather be richer; although, many of them are, I think, public spirited enough to say let's change this.

Let's put some spending constraints on across the board. Let's raise revenues in a way that will not have a negative effect on the economy or on the quality of lives of those people paying it, and let's lock in that so that in the near term we can stop forcing States and cities to lay people off. We can continue the kind of policies that will help put some people back to work in the construction industry, such as in highways. We can also, I hope, get the people at the Federal Housing Finance Administration to stop resisting the administration's effort to help with housing.

□ 1400

If there is cooperation, and if we learn the lessons of the past, we can make this economy work.

I would include one final point, and I will be talking about this some more. One of the great successes we have seen in the past few years has been the policies under a Bush appointee, Benjamin Bernanke, George Bush's chief economic adviser, whom George Bush gave the most important economic post in America, Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

Chairman Bernanke has pushed hard to have the Federal Reserve be a constructive force in our economy. People on the right in particular were saying it is going to cause terrible inflation. Rarely in American history has a flat prediction been more wrong. The quantitative easing, and the intervention of the Fed has produced no inflation. It has made money for the Federal Gov-

ernment. It hasn't cost us anything. It has been very helpful.

In fact, the Fed has been setting a good example for Europe. One of the best things that has happened with regard to Europe lately, as perceived by the markets as well as others, is that people noted that the European Central Bank was beginning to take some of the lessons from the U.S. Federal Reserve and work more like them.

If we stop harassing the Federal Reserve about the reasonable pro-expansionary policies it has been following and we stop forcing State and local governments from firing people who perform useful services and are unfortunately added to the unemployment figure, if we will produce Federal funding not to try to mediate a dispute in Iraq but to build highways here and to clean up our water systems, and if we will ask the wealthiest people in America to give a little bit more, which they won't miss but which will help us, then the good day that we had today—it was a very good day in the economic news. I noticed even Fox News almost begrudgingly had to say, Wow, what a good economic report. I give Chris Wallace credit because he cut right through and said that when there was someone who wanted to carp.

There were 250,000 new private sector jobs today. If we can keep that up, then maybe the 250,000 private sector jobs will become 300,000, and maybe we will add 5,000 or 10,000 public sector jobs that were lost where we need cops and firefighters and people to keep our cities clean.

If this Congress, through an ideological rigidity that has been proven wrong by the facts, does not interfere, if we are supportive of the very sensible program that the President has laid out, independently supported by that Bush appointee Mr. Bernanke at the Federal Reserve, America will continue to have the best developed economy in the world, and we can get the kind of recovery that the American people deserve.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HAHN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a funeral in the district.

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of business in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 6, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED
PURSUANT TO THE CONGRES-
SIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of September 13, 2011, through January 3, 2012, shall be treated as though received on February 3, 2012. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

4826. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 777-200, -200LR, -300, and -300ER Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1317; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-16893; AD 2011-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4827. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0651; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-041-AD; Amendment 39-16879; AD 2011-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4828. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1298; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-16888; AD 2011-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4829. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. (CMI) Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1341; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-41-AD; Amendment 39-16891; AD 2011-25-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4830. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0914; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-16876; AD 2011-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4831. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co. KG Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1299; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-16878; AD 2011-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4832. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, B1, B2, B3, BA, C D, and D1; and AS355E, F, F1, F2, N, and NP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1158; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-16847; AD 2011-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4833. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 120B Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0448; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-51-AD; Amendment 39-16841; AD 2011-21-18] (RIN: 2102-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4834. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Quest Aircraft Design, LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1328; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-16880; AD 2011-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4835. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1252; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-16874; AD 2011-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4836. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0720; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-252-AD; Amendment 39-16867; AD 2011-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4837. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (RRD) BR700-710 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0684; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-16842; AD 2011-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4838. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-27747; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-16782; AD 2009-10-09 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4839. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1206; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-16868; AD 2011-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4840. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Model GV and GV-SP Airplanes [Docket

No.: FAA-2011-0572; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-009-AD; Amendment 39-16866; AD 2011-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4841. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney division (PW) PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0733; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-16885; AD 2011-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4842. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; The Dalles, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0893; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-18] received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4843. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0954; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-16865; AD 2011-24-01] received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4844. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 400) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0648; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-276-AD; Amendment 39-16859; AD 2011-23-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4845. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International, Inc. TP331 Model Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0935; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-16813; AD 2011-18-51R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4846. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada PT6A-15AG, -27, -28, -34, -34AG, -34B, and -36 Series Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1038; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-16834; AD 2011-20-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4847. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0255; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-253-AD; Amendment 39-16844; AD 2010-22-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4848. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0650; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-16846; AD 2011-22-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4849. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Model AS332C, AS332L, AS332LL, and ASS332L2 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0939; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-16798; AD 2011-18-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4850. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-215-1A10, CL-215-6B11 (CL-215T Variant), and CL-125-6B11 (CL-415 Variant) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1096; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-16848; AD 2011-22-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4851. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Model EC225LP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1033; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-43-AD; Amendment 39-16815; AD 2011-20-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4852. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S-92A Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0792; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-19-AD; Amendment 39-16762; AD 2011-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4853. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Model EC225LP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1074; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-028-AD; Amendment 39-16834; AD 2011-21-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4854. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Erickson Air-Crane Incorporated Model S-64F Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0909; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-026-AD; Amendment 39-16835; AD 2011-21-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4855. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 204B, 205A, 205A-1, 205B, 210, 212, 412, 412CF, 412EP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1041; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-109-AD; Amendment 39-16821; AD 2010-26-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 537. Resolution providing

for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 186. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; with an amendment (Rept. 112-386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1162. A bill to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3894. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Pullman Historic Site in Chicago, Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3895. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to clarify that all veterans programs are exempt from sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend section 8007 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to extend eligibility for emergency and modernization grants to local educational agencies in which at least 10 percent of the property in each such agency is nontaxable due to the presence of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide religious conscience protections for individuals and organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3898. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen financial disclosures by Members, officers, and employees of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 3899. A bill to provide for rollover treatment to traditional IRAs of amounts received in airline carrier bankruptcy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3900. A bill to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL pipeline is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CONNOLLY of

Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 538. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 4, 2012, as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. ROHRBACHER introduced a bill (H.R. 3901) for the relief of Dr. Shakeel Afridi; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3894.

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

13th Amendment

14th Amendment

Commerce clause

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3895.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 3896.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the U.S. Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Also, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution, which states that "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. CHABOT:

H.R. 3897.

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

According to the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3898.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 of Article 1, Section 5, collectively grant Congress the authority to determine the rules of its proceedings and the requirements it chooses to place upon its Members.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3899.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 3900.

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

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 3901.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 32: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 36: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 85: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 115: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 192: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 245: Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 361: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 432: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 436: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 459: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 494: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 505: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 601: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 797: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 798: 998: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 998: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1116: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1148: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1163: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1168: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1206: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1340: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 1370: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. GALLEGLEY.

H.R. 1380: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1385: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1568: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1581: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1588: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1648: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1681: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1697: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1876: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1895: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1960: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2108: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2118: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2139: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2140: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2181: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2238: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2268: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 2299: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2335: Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 2364: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2429: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2569: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. WEBSTER.

H.R. 2607: Mr. BACA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. REYES, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2697: Mr. CARTER and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 2970: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2982: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3030: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3042: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3059: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3086: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3221: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 3307: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3313: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3324: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 3339: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3365: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 3423: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 3481: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 3483: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3532: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3536: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3541: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3553: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3599: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3608: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3612: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 3634: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3643: Mr. SHULER, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 3654: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3663: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3676: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3702: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3712: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3713: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. ADAMS.

H.R. 3767: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3768: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3783: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. TURNER of New York.

H.R. 3802: Mr. JONES, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3803: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 3805: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3811: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CANSECO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3814: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 3826: Mr. HOLT, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3828: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 3842: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 3867: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 3875: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Mr.

GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 3877: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3886: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 509: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 532: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. ROONEY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 3, February 1, 2012, by Mr. TIMOTHY WALZ on H.R. 1148, was signed by the following Members: Timothy J. Walz, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Al Green, Mark S. Critz, Kathleen C. Hochul, Alcee L. Hastings, Steve Cohen, Karen Bass, Doris O. Matsui, Marcia L. Fudge, Janice D. Schakowsky, David Loebsack, Barney Frank, Timothy H. Bishop, John A. Yarmuth, Ben Chandler, Peter A. DeFazio, Mike Thompson, William R. Keating, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Edolphus Towns, Martin Heinrich, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Laura Richardson, Brad Sherman, Jim Cooper, Dale E. Kildee, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Joe Donnelly, Dan Boren, John C. Carney, Jr., Rosa L. DeLauro, John Lewis, Carolyn McCarthy, Donald M. Payne, Jackie Speier, Carolyn B. Maloney, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Yvette D. Clarke, Marcy Kaptur, David N. Cicilline, Lois Capps, Lloyd Doggett, William L. Owens, Betty McCollum, Gene Green, Henry A. Waxman, Adam B. Schiff, Robert E. Andrews, Henry Cuellar, Danny K. Davis, Sheila Jackson Lee, Jared Polis, Howard L. Berman, John Barrow, Nancy Pelosi, Rush D. Holt, Mike McIntyre, James R. Langevin, Lynn C. Woolsey, G. K. Butterfield, Christopher S. Murphy, Barbara Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Frederica S. Wilson, Terri A. Sewell, Gary L. Ackerman, Charles A. Gonzalez, Brian Higgins, Tammy Baldwin, Leonard L. Boswell, James P. McGovern, Chellie Pingree, Niki Tsongas, Mike Quigley, Kathy Castor, Jim McDermott, Elijah E. Cummings, Jason Altmire, Mazie Hirono, Russ Carnahan, Ed Perlmutter, Rick Larsen, Gary C. Peters, Cedric L. Richmond, Joe Courtney, Wm. Lacy Clay, Keith Ellison, Frank Pallone, Jr., Brian P. Bilbray, Walter B. Jones, Gregory W. Meeks, Betty Sutton, Paul Tonko, Linda T. Sánchez, Donna F. Edwards, John Garamendi, Collin C. Peterson, Sander M. Levin, Xavier Becerra, John W. Olver, Chris Van Hollen, Steny H. Hoyer, Maxine Waters, Ron Kind, John B. Larson, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Joseph Crowley, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Larry Kissell, Steven R. Rothman, Dennis A. Cardoza, Jim Costa, Corrine Brown, Judy Chu, Theodore E. Deutch, Zoe Lofgren, Adam Smith, Janice Hahn, David Scott, Bruce L. Braley, Peter Welch, John F. Tierney, Stephen F. Lynch, Raúl M. Grijalva, George Miller, James A. Himes, James E. Clyburn, Diana DeGette, Nita M. Lowey, John Conyers, Jr., Robert A. Brady, Emanuel Cleaver, Earl Blumenauer, Grace F. Napolitano, Sam Farr, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David E. Price, Richard E. Neal, Michael H. Michaud, Jerry F. Costello, Charles B. Rangel, Anna G. Eshoo, Tim Holden, Jerrold Nadler, Mike Ross, Bennie G. Thompson, Silvestre Reyes, José E. Serrano, Ed Pastor, Joe Baca, Norman D. Dicks, Gerald E. Connolly, Michael E. Capuano, Ben Ray Lujan, Eliot L. Engel, Shelley Berkley, Nick J. Rahall II, Daniel Lipinski, Dennis J. Kucinich, Chaka Fattah, Brad Miller, Loretta Sanchez, Susan A. Davis, Jerry McNerney, Melvin L. Watt, Jay Inslee, and Nydia M. Velázquez.