



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 18, 2011

No. 107

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 18, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

### PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day. Please help us to use it well.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given. Help them to meet their responsibilities during these days, to attend to the immediate needs and concerns of the moment, all the while enlightened by the majesty of Your creation and Your eternal Spirit.

We give You thanks that we all can know and share the fruits of Your Spirit, especially in this time the virtues of tolerance and reconciliation, of justice and righteousness, of goodwill and understanding, of patience and loving care for others.

Watch over this House, and cause Your blessing to be upon each Member, that they might serve all the people with sincerity and truth.

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

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### DELAYING ON THE DEBT SOLUTION

(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, over the weekend, concerned constituents advised me they are tired of hearing politicians grandstand about fixing the Nation's debt ceiling. The current administration has proven it would rather threaten our senior citizens than propose reasonable solutions that would benefit families.

Liberals refuse to listen to the American people. Americans voted for Washington to cut spending. Liberals want to impose "more revenues," which is Washingtonspeak for more job-killing taxes.

In August of 2009, then-Senator Barack Obama stated "raising taxes in a recession would be the last thing you want to do." That is particularly true today, as over 14 million Americans are without jobs. The President's policies of borrow and spend have failed and we must change course.

This debt crisis is a result of Washington spending money it does not have. That is why House Republicans have proposed the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan. Tomorrow, I hope Democrats will join us to vote for this positive proposal to promote more jobs created by small businesses.

□ 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.

H5129

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

#### IT IS NOT ABOUT PROTECTING BILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in all the debate about the debt ceiling, the biggest falsehood is that Republicans want to protect the multimillionaires and billionaires. The millionaires and billionaires can take care of themselves; and, in fact, they come out ahead especially when government gets too big. And Republicans lose the superwealthy areas usually by two-to-one margins or more.

The reason we don't want tax increases is because the Federal Government is so wasteful. The least economical, least efficient way to spend money is to turn it over to the Federal Government. Look at how little good the \$862 billion stimulus did. Unemployment went up.

Every dollar that can be kept in the private sector will do much more to create jobs and keep prices down. The ones who will benefit the most from more money in the private sector will be the middle- and lower-income working people. If this wasn't true, the Soviet Union and Cuba would have been heaven on Earth.

It is not about protecting billionaires—not in the least.

#### STOP THE OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

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

Ms. FOXX. I would like to associate myself with the comments of my colleague from Tennessee. I agree with every word he said.

And I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker: Why is our national debt so high? It's because spending is too high.

It's pretty simple. Our debt crisis is the result of Washington spending money it doesn't have and leaving the tab for taxpayers and future generations to pick up. That's irresponsible.

The only way out is reducing spending, since at least 40 cents of every dollar we're spending is added directly to the national debt.

And, no, despite what our friends on the other side of the aisle would say, raising tax rates and confiscating more money isn't the solution. That ignores the reality that Washington has a chronic overspending problem, not an undertaxing problem.

If we're going to restore economic certainty, bolster job growth, and keep America competitive, we need to stop spending money we don't have. Mr. Speaker, we've got to start cutting spending, and we've got to start it now.

#### IT'S TIME FOR THE PRESIDENT TO ACT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, right now this United States Congress is writing post-dated checks on an overdrawn account. We're on a path to fiscal destruction, one that may threaten the very fabric of our Republic.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, we may be lucky that we have a statutory debt limit because it forces both branches of the legislative branch of government and the executive branch to sit down and have the hard discussions that are necessary at this point in our Nation's history. Does anyone really believe we would be here having these discussions if we didn't have to?

There is going to be a bill on the floor this week called Cut, Cap, and Balance; and it allows the President his wish for expanding the debt limit at the same time it caps spending, cuts current spending, and allows for a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

The President issued a veto threat today, and I think that is unfortunate. The President has refused to offer any meaningful plan of his own, anything that is scorable. Anything that even has the barest of details the President has failed to provide. And, of course, we all wonder what's happening over in the other body.

This country doesn't need more debt; it needs more jobs. But we need to quit spending money we don't have and put people back to work. Dealing with these important issues is what we need to do, and then let Americans do what they do best: create, innovate, and lead.

#### CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE OUR BUDGET

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. A short time ago, the President issued an administration policy statement saying that he would veto Cut, Cap, and Balance.

I appreciate the President's offering a moment of clarity. He said: "Instead of pursuing an empty political statement and unrealistic policy goals, it is necessary to move beyond politics as usual and find bipartisan common ground."

All we ask is that we balance our budget. For the President to suggest that balancing our budget is not common ground does provide clarity.

This President has no plan to balance our budget. The budget that he submitted never balances. In fact, it doubles and triples the debt.

We're asking that if the President wants to raise the debt ceiling, we must solve the underlying problem; and the underlying problem is we're

borrowing, taxing, and spending too much money in this country.

The President says, "passing a balanced budget amendment that, in the years ahead, will likely leave the Nation unable to meet its core commitment of ensuring dignity in retirement."

Mr. President, if we don't balance this budget, if we don't take care of our debt, if we don't pay off our debts, this country will be bankrupt.

We're spending and borrowing too much money. We can no longer borrow 40 cents out of every dollar in this country. That's why we must pass Cut, Cap, and Balance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1410

#### CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, we're here today because this country has a spending addiction. My 36-plus years in law enforcement told me that when someone has an addiction, you have to first address and admit that you have a problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bill that is coming up this week called Cut, Cap, and Balance. The important part of that bill is the balance part. This Nation needs a balanced budget amendment, just like 49 States that make up this great Union have a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there's been a threat laid upon us that there will be a veto if we pass this. Mr. Speaker, unless we address our addiction to spending, we will never ever get to a point where the children that we have sitting in the audience, those that are sitting here that have children are never going to be able to pass on a greater opportunity to them, just like was passed on to me by my parents.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 5 p.m.

#### CHURCH PLAN INVESTMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 33) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Church Plan Investment Clarification Act".*

**SEC. 2. SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AMENDMENT.**

*Section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(2)) is amended—*

*(1) by inserting "(other than a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to the extent that the interest or participation in such single trust fund or collective trust fund is issued to a church, a convention or association of churches, or an organization described in section 414(e)(3)(A) of such Code establishing or maintaining the retirement income account or to a trust established by any such entity in connection with the retirement income account)" after "403(b) of such Code"; and*

*(2) by inserting "(other than a person participating in a church plan who is described in section 414(e)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)" after "section 401(c)(1) of such Code".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 33, the Church Plan Investment Clarification Act. I would like to thank my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for their support of this legislation. I would also like to thank Mr. CARSON of Indiana for managing the bill for the other side of the aisle.

H.R. 33, the Church Plan Investment Clarification Act, is a technical corrections bill to amend Public Law 108-359, the Church Pension Fairness Act. It clarifies an exemption in current law to allow church pension plans, like secular pension plans, to invest in collective trusts.

Due to a technical error included in the 2004 law, the necessary exemption from the Securities Act of 1933 was not provided to give church pension plans access to collective trusts. Collective trusts allow pension plans to pool their assets, diversify their investments, and share risk and transaction costs with other pension plans, thereby reaping the benefits of collective buying power. Again, H.R. 33 clarifies that church pension plans, like secular plans, may invest in collective trusts.

On June 22, 2011, the House Committee on Financial Services by voice vote unanimously approved H.R. 33. This bill is similar to the original Church Pension Fairness Act bill, H.R. 1533, which the House passed in 2003 by a vote of 397-0.

Finally, the bill is supported by a number of organizations, including the Church Alliance; the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits of the United Methodist Church; the YMCA Retirement Fund; Everence Financial on behalf of the Mennonite Retirement Trust, the retirement plan for the Mennonite Church USA; the Seventh-Day Adventist Church in North America; Church Pension Group, on behalf of the Church Pension Fund, an independent agency of the Episcopal Church; the Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board of the American Baptist Churches in the USA; the Board of Pensions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and the Pensions Board of the United Church of Christ.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit church pension plans to invest in collective trusts by correcting a technical error that resulted from the interaction of the securities laws and the Tax Code. In 2003, Mr. Speaker, Congress passed legislation that was intended to accomplish this goal, but the final law did not make the necessary corrections to the Securities Act of 1933. As such, IRS regulations currently prevent collective trusts from allowing investments by church plans.

This bill will make it more cost-efficient for a religious organization to manage its pension plans by allowing the plan to manage its assets through a collective trust mechanism alongside the assets of other pension plans. Church pension plans will no longer have to be managed separately, which creates greater costs to the plan and its participants. The bill, Mr. Speaker, effectively provides another option for church pension plans and allows them to be managed much more like other kinds of pension plans, and will minimize costs.

This bill is supported by the Church Alliance, a coalition of 37 denominational benefit programs that provide pensions and health benefits to more than 1 million clergy across this country, lay workers, and their family members.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 33, "The Church Plan Investment Clarification Act." This legislation will allow church pension plans to participate in collective trusts.

Collective trusts allow pension plans to combine assets to invest in various stock and non stock options. This provides pension plans an opportunity to diversify investment portfolios,

while sharing risks and transaction costs with other pension plans.

Under current law, thousands of church pension plans are denied participation in collective trusts, rendering them unable to pool their assets and reap the benefits of collective buying power. Many churches, as a result, experience difficulties and incur expenses when diversifying pension plan investments.

I support the Church Plan Investment Clarifications Act to amend the Securities Act of 1933. Amending current securities legislation will broaden the existing exemption to collective trusts to include church pension plans. This bill will clarify that clergy and lay workers are able to invest in collective trusts, despite their unique tax status. The Act affords church pension plans the same securities law treatment that is extended to governmental plans.

Churches provide invaluable services to our communities. Across the Nation, church pension plans will benefit from this bipartisan bill, including churches in Houston, Texas, where I represent the 18th Congressional District. Churches such as the Bellfort Seventh Day Adventist Church, New Light Christian Church and the Community of Faith Church. This legislation will be of great significance to the Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church, the St. John Missionary Baptist Church on Dowling, the Brooks Hollow Baptist Church, and Houses of worship throughout our community and Nation.

These faith institutions in Houston, as well as throughout the country, will no longer have to individually bear the burden of high fees on investment transactions for their retirement plans. The clergy and lay workers that will benefit from this legislation have spent their entire careers serving others. The least we can offer in return is the opportunity for these pension plans to pool their resources in order to decrease costs associated with funding their retirement plans.

This bill is also supported by The Church Alliance, the Seventh Day Adventist Church, the YMCA Retirement Fund, the Church Pension Group, and others. I thank my friend from Illinois for sponsoring this important legislation, and urge my colleagues to work together to pass the Church Plan Investment Clarification Act.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 33, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: the motion to suspend on H.R. 33; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

CHURCH PLAN INVESTMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act, as amended, 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 motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 1, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—310

Ackerman	Buerkle	Crenshaw
Adams	Burgess	Critz
Aderholt	Butterfield	Cuellar
Alexander	Canseco	Culberson
Altmire	Cantor	Cummings
Austria	Capito	Davis (IL)
Baca	Carnahan	Davis (KY)
Bachus	Carney	DeLauro
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Denham
Barletta	Cassidy	DesJarlais
Bartlett	Chabot	Deutch
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bass (CA)	Chandler	Dold
Bass (NH)	Chu	Donnelly (IN)
Becerra	Cicilline	Doyle
Benishkek	Clarke (MI)	Dreier
Berg	Clarke (NY)	Duffy
Berkley	Cleaver	Duncan (SC)
Biggert	Clyburn	Duncan (TN)
Bilbray	Coffman (CO)	Edwards
Bishop (UT)	Cohen	Elmiers
Blackburn	Cole	Engel
Bonner	Conaway	Farenthold
Boustany	Connolly (VA)	Fincher
Brady (TX)	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Fleischmann
Broun (GA)	Courtney	Fleming
Brown (FL)	Crawford	Flores

Fox	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Frank (MA)	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Latta	Rooney
Frelinghuysen	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fudge	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
Gallegly	Lewis (GA)	Ross (AR)
Garamendi	LoBiondo	Ross (FL)
Gardner	Long	Roybal-Allard
Garrett	Lowey	Royce
Gibbs	Lucas	Runyan
Gibson	Luetkemeyer	Ruppersberger
Gohmert	Lujan	Ryan (OH)
Gonzalez	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel E.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Gosar	Maloney	Sarbanes
Gowdy	Marino	Scalise
Graves (GA)	Markey	Schiff
Green, Al	Matheson	Schilling
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schmidt
Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)	Schock
Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Grimm	McClintock	Schweikert
Guinta	McGovern	Scott (SC)
Guthrie	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Hall	McKinley	Scott, Austin
Hanabusa	McMorris	Scott, David
Hanna	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Harper	Meehan	Serrano
Hartzler	Mica	Sessions
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Sherman
Hayworth	Miller (MD)	Shuler
Heck	Miller (NC)	Sires
Hensarling	Moore	Smith (NE)
Herger	Moran	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (CT)	Smith (TX)
Higgins	Murphy (PA)	Southerland
Himes	Myrick	Nadler
Hinojosa	Nadler	Napolitano
Hirono	Napolitano	Neal
Hochul	Neugebauer	Sullivan
Holden	Noem	Terry
Holt	Nugent	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Huelskamp	Pallone	Thornberry
Huizenga (MI)	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Hunter	Paul	Tipton
Hurt	Payne	Tonko
Inslee	Pearce	Towns
Israel	Pelosi	Turner
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Upton
Jackson Lee (TX)	Peterson	Van Hollen
Jenkins	Petri	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Pitts	Viscosky
Johnson (OH)	Platts	Walden
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Walsh (IL)
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Walz (MN)
Jones	Price (GA)	Wasserman
Jordan	Price (NC)	Schultz
Keating	Quigley	Waxman
Kelly	Rahall	Webster
Kildee	Rangel	Welch
Kind	Reed	West
King (IA)	Rehberg	Westmoreland
King (NY)	Reichert	Whitfield
Kingston	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Kissell	Reyes	Wittman
Kline	Ribble	Wolf
Kucinich	Richardson	Womack
Lamborn	Richmond	Woodall
Lance	Rigell	Woolsey
Landry	Rivera	Yarmuth
Langevin	Roby	Yoder
Lankford	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)
Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)	
Larson (CT)		

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—120

Akin	Burton (IN)	DeGette
Andrews	Calvert	Dent
Bachmann	Camp	Dicks
Barrow	Campbell	Dingell
Berman	Capps	Doggett
Bilirakis	Capuano	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Cardoza	Emerson
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Eshoo
Black	Castor (FL)	Farr
Blumenauer	Clay	Fattah
Bono Mack	Coble	Filner
Boren	Costa	Flake
Boswell	Costello	Forbes
Brady (PA)	Cravaack	Fortenberry
Brooks	Crowley	Gerlach
Buchanan	Davis (CA)	Giffords
Bucshon	DeFazio	Gingrey (GA)

Granger	McCollum	Rohrabacher
Graves (MO)	McCotter	Rokita
Grijalva	McDermott	Rothman (NJ)
Gutierrez	McHenry	Rush
Harris	McKeon	Sanchez, Loretta
Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Schakowsky
Heinrich	Meeks	Schrader
Hinche	Michaud	Shimkus
Hultgren	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Issa	Miller, George	Simpson
Johnson (IL)	Mulvaney	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nunnelee	Smith (WA)
Kinzinger (IL)	Olver	Speier
Labrador	Owens	Stutzman
Lee (CA)	Palazzo	Tiberi
Lipinski	Pascrell	Tsongas
Loeb	Paulsen	Walberg
Lofgren, Zoe	Pence	Waters
Lynch	Perlmutter	Watt
Mack	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Manzullo	Poe (TX)	Wu
Marchant	Pompeo	Young (AK)
McCaul	Quayle	Young (FL)

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601, I was unable to vote due to previous commitments in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601, I was unavoidably detained from arriving before the close of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601, for final passage of H.R. 33, I was previously detained for a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend to votes in the House today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 33, the Church Plan Investment Clarification Act.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 56, answered "present" 1, not voting 130, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

YEAS—244

Ackerman	Alexander	Bachus
Adams	Austria	Barletta
Aderholt	Baca	Bartlett

Barton (TX)	Hayworth	Price (GA)	Sullivan	Thompson (CA)	Tipton
Bass (CA)	Hensarling	Price (NC)	Terry	Thompson (MS)	Walden
Bass (NH)	Herger	Quigley			
Becerra	Higgins	Rahall			
Benishek	Hinojosa	Rangel			
Berg	Hirono	Rehberg			
Berkley	Holden	Reichert			
Biggert	Holt	Ribble			
Bilbray	Hoyer	Richardson	Akin	Eshoo	Miller, George
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Richmond	Andrews	Farr	Moore
Bonner	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell	Bachmann	Fattah	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rivera	Barrow	Filner	Nunnelee
Brown (FL)	Hurt	Roby	Berman	Flake	Olver
Buerkle	Inslee	Roe (TN)	Bilirakis	Forbes	Owens
Butterfield	Israel	Rogers (AL)	Bishop (GA)	Portenberry	Palazzo
Canseco	Jackson (IL)	Rogers (KY)	Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	Pascrell
Cantor	Jenkins	Rooney	Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Paulsen
Capito	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Black	Gingrey (GA)	Pence
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Roskam	Blumenauer	Gohmert	Perlmutter
Carney	Johnson, Sam	Roskam	Bono Mack	Granger	Pingree (ME)
Cassidy	Jordan	Ross (AR)	Boren	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Chabot	Kelly	Ross (FL)	Boswell	Grijalva	Pompeo
Chaffetz	Kildee	Royal-Allard	Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Quayle
Cicilline	King (IA)	Royce	Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Clarke (MI)	King (NY)	Runyan	Brady (IA)	Heinrich	Rohrabacher
Clarke (NY)	Kingston	Ruppenger	Brooks	Hinche	Rokita
Cleaver	Kissell	Ryan (OH)	Buchanan	Hultgren	Rothman (NJ)
Clyburn	Kline	Ryan (WI)	Buchanan	Issa	Rush
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Sánchez, Linda	Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Lance	T.	Calvert	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cole	Landry	Scalise	Camp	Kinzinger (IL)	Schrader
Conaway	Langevin	Schiff	Campbell	Labrador	Shimkus
Connolly (VA)	Lankford	Schilling	Capps	Larsen (WA)	Shuster
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schmidt	Capuano	Lee (CA)	Simpson
Cooper	LaTourette	Schock	Cardoza	Lipinski	Sires
Courtney	Latta	Schwartz	Carter	Loebsack	Slaughter
Crawford	Levin	Schweikert	Castor (FL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Scott (SC)	Clay	Lynch	Speier
Critz	Long	Scott (VA)	Coble	Mack	Stutzman
Culberson	Lowey	Scott, Austin	Costa	Manzullo	Tiberi
Cummings	Lucas	Scott, David	Costello	Marchant	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner	Cravaack	Markey	Tsongas
DeLauro	Luján	Serrano	Crowley	McCaul	Walberg
Denham	Lummis	Sessions	Davis (CA)	McCollum	Waters
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Sewell	DeFazio	McCotter	Watt
Deutch	E.	Sherman	DeGette	McDermott	Welch
Diaz-Balart	Maloney	Smith (NE)	Dent	McHenry	Wilson (FL)
Doyle	Marino	Smith (NJ)	Dicks	McKeon	Wu
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)	Dingell	McNeerney	Young (AK)
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (NY)	Southerland	Doggett	Meeks	Young (FL)
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Stark	Ellison	Michaud	
Edwards	McGovern	Stearns	Emerson	Miller, Gary	
Ellmers	McIntyre	Sutton			
Engel	McMorris	Thompson (PA)			
Fincher	Rodgers	Thornberry			
Fleischmann	Mica	Tonko			
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Towns			
Flores	Miller (MI)	Turner			
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Upton			
Franks (AZ)	Moran	Van Hollen			
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez			
Fudge	Murphy (PA)	Vislosky			
Gallely	Myrick	Walsh (IL)			
Garamendi	Nadler	Walz (MN)			
Garrett	Neal	Wasserman			
Gonzalez	Neugebauer	Schultz			
Goodlatte	Noem	Waxman			
Gosar	Nugent	Webster			
Gowdy	Nunes	West			
Graves (GA)	Olson	Westmoreland			
Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)	Whitfield			
Griffin (AR)	Paul	Wilson (SC)			
Griffith (VA)	Payne	Wittman			
Guinta	Pearce	Wolf			
Guthrie	Pelosi	Womack			
Hall	Petri	Woodall			
Hanabusa	Pitts	Woolsey			
Harper	Platts	Yarmuth			
Hartzler	Polis	Yoder			
Hastings (FL)	Posey	Young (IN)			

NAYS—56

Altmire	Gibson	Latham
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Boustany	Grimm	LoBiondo
Burgess	Hanna	Matheson
Carson (IN)	Harris	Matsui
Chandler	Heck	McKinley
Chu	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Cuellar	Himes	Napolitano
Davis (KY)	Hochul	Pallone
Dold	Honda	Peters
Donnelly (IN)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Duffy	(TX)	Reed
Farenthold	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Fitzpatrick	Jones	Reyes
Fox	Keating	Sarbanes
Gardner	Kind	Shuler
Gibbs	Kucinich	Stivers

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash  
NOT VOTING—130

Akin	Eshoo	Miller, George
Andrews	Farr	Moore
Bachmann	Fattah	Mulvaney
Barrow	Filner	Nunnelee
Berman	Flake	Olver
Bilirakis	Forbes	Owens
Bishop (GA)	Portenberry	Palazzo
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	Pascrell
Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Paulsen
Black	Gingrey (GA)	Pence
Blumenauer	Gohmert	Perlmutter
Bono Mack	Granger	Pingree (ME)
Boren	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Boswell	Grijalva	Pompeo
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Quayle
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Brady (IA)	Heinrich	Rohrabacher
Brooks	Hinche	Rokita
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rothman (NJ)
Buchanan	Issa	Rush
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Calvert	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Camp	Kinzinger (IL)	Schrader
Campbell	Labrador	Shimkus
Capps	Larsen (WA)	Shuster
Capuano	Lee (CA)	Simpson
Cardoza	Lipinski	Sires
Carter	Loebsack	Slaughter
Castor (FL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Clay	Lynch	Speier
Coble	Mack	Stutzman
Costa	Manzullo	Tiberi
Costello	Marchant	Tierney
Cravaack	Markey	Tsongas
Crowley	McCaul	Walberg
Davis (CA)	McCollum	Waters
DeFazio	McCotter	Watt
DeGette	McDermott	Welch
Dent	McHenry	Wilson (FL)
Dicks	McKeon	Wu
Dingell	McNeerney	Young (AK)
Doggett	Meeks	Young (FL)
Ellison	Michaud	
Emerson	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1905

Ms. HOCHUL changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 602, I was unable to vote due to previous commitments in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601 and 602, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 601 on passage of H.R. 33—To amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act. Additionally, had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 602, on approving the Journal.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes today. Had I been present to cast my votes, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 33 and "yes" on approving the Journal.

ANNIVERSARY OF ATTACK ON AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to mark the anniversary of the attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

On July 18, 1994, the Iranian regime, through the coordinated efforts of its embassy and extremist proxy Hezbollah, committed one of the deadliest attacks of anti-Semitism in the Western Hemisphere by killing 85 men, women and children and injuring over 300 innocent bystanders. Seventeen years later, Mr. Speaker, the regime has yet to answer for its role in the attack. Its statement this weekend was nothing more than a desperate PR attempt to manipulate the headlines in advance of today's sad anniversary.

And so as we mark the 17th anniversary of this horrible attack and honor the victims and the survivors of that day, we must recommit ourselves to holding the Iranian regime accountable for the AMIA attack and for the threat that it continues to pose to U.S. regional and global security.

IN SUPPORT OF CHURCH PLAN INVESTMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, flying in today, our plane was delayed. I didn't have the opportunity to advance my support for H.R. 33, the Church Plan Investment Clarification Act of 2011. I want to acknowledge the sponsorship of Congresswoman BIGGERT and indicate that under current law thousands of church pension plans are denied participation in collective trusts, rendering them unable to pull their assets or reap the benefits of collective buying power. Many churches, as a result, experience difficulties and incur expenses when diversifying pension plans.

Our churches, our houses of worship provide invaluable service, and many of those in my own community—the Bellfort Seventh Day Adventist Church, the New Life Christian Church, Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church, St. John Missionary Baptist Church on Dowling, Brookhollow, and many others, work throughout our community. We are blessed to have Lakewood Church in our community, as well, that works very hard, a church leadership that I've known for many, many years.

So this bill has been supported by the Church Alliance, the Seventh Day Adventist Church, the YMCA Retirement Fund, the Church Pension Group, and others. And I thank my friend from Illinois, as I said. Churches do missionary work. Their workers need to have the ability to have their pensions.

And I close by saying there are those suffering in Kenya, they are dying, the Somalians who left because of the devastation of the drought, and I know our faith community wants us to do something about it.

#### REMEMBERING STANLEY REED, A GREAT LEADER IN ARKANSAS

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember a great leader from the State of Arkansas, Mr. Stanley Reed. Stanley Reed was prematurely taken away from us last Friday, but his legacy will live on.

Stanley was from Marianna in Lee County, but his influence is felt throughout the entire State of Arkansas. He served as president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau and worked tirelessly for the agriculture community, leading several initiatives to advance Arkansas agriculture.

For 10 years, he served on the Board of Trustees for the University of Arkansas. Stanley placed a great emphasis on the importance of education, and it can be seen through his work at the university.

Stanley was also an advocate for Arkansas businesses. He served on the Board of Arkansas World Trade Center where he shared his vision for Arkansas businesses to compete in the global economy.

Stanley leaves behind his wife, Charlene, his children—Nathan, Haley and Anna—and three grandchildren. Arkansas lost a great leader, advocate, and ambassador last week; but Stanley Reed's legacy will live on through the impact of his work.

□ 1910

#### SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAMS UNDER ATTACK

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, later this week, this House will take up the second iteration—the second coming, if you will—of the House Republican budget, a budget designed to destroy Medicare, basically to terminate it for anyone who's 55 years or younger, a plan designed to put Social Security on a track to privatization, a plan designed to take nearly \$700 billion out of the Medicaid program, basically destroying those things that have held the fabric of America together.

Have no illusions about what this is all about. It's not just a constitutional

amendment; it's not just cut and cap. It is really about destroying Medicare, Medicaid, programs that are essential for seniors.

If you want to make a cut in something, why don't you take a third of a trillion dollars out of the war in Afghanistan, which is what we're going to spend over the next 4 years? Now there's a good cut that we ought to make.

#### PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOE MEADE: AN AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true American hero, Private First Class Joe Meade. Private First Class Meade was a member of Mike Company, 3rd Battalion, 26th Marines. He died in Vietnam when his battalion was fighting outside Da Nang. While carrying a wounded comrade to a waiting helicopter, Joe stepped on a land mine and, sadly, was killed. Private Meade was only 19 at the time. In recognition of his valor, he was awarded the Silver Star.

Duane Crawford, Private Meade's former commanding officer, who recently founded a scholarship in his honor, had these words to say about Joe's actions:

"With total disregard for his own life, he continually exposed himself to danger by administering first aid to his wounded comrades, offering them comforting words and helping them to medivac helicopters. His courageous actions saved many lives."

Even though he lived only 19 years, the legacy Joe left behind is truly remarkable. Private First Class Meade exemplified the best of America and the United States Marine Corps. For this reason, I ask you to join me in commemorating the life of this extraordinary marine.

Semper Fi, and this is an honor for the 58,479 of our comrades who died in Vietnam.

#### ONE SOLUTION AND THREE SIMPLE STEPS

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

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, I have three simple words for President Obama and congressional Democrats: cut, cap, and balance. Last week when our Campaigner in Chief held his news conference, he asked for a plan.

Well, Mr. President, cut, cap and balance is our plan. It's a plan that cuts Federal spending immediately, puts in place enforceable spending caps, and demands a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. This plan cuts total spending by \$111 billion in 2012 and around \$5.8 trillion over the next 10 years, while not increasing taxes one single penny. We have too much debt

because we spend too much, not because we haven't taxed you enough.

Mr. President, you asked for a plan and here it is. It's your turn to get serious and work with us to solve this problem—not against us. Stop demagoguing this issue with cheap scare tactics and politics because the American people are tired of it and deserve much better.

#### ON THE RECOVERY OF RINGGOLD, GEORGIA

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to let the American people know that the city of Ringgold, Georgia, is open for business. I know that we all remember the tornadoes that ravaged much of the country in April. Over 180 of these destructive storms were confirmed in just one day, and the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia was not spared. Some of the worst storm damage in north Georgia occurred in the small town of Ringgold. Over 100 businesses and 500 homes were damaged or destroyed on April 27. This was a devastating moment to the local community and the local economy, which relies heavily on travelers passing through on Interstate 75.

However, Ringgold is on the mend and ready to share some of that southern hospitality it is known so well for. Nearly half of the damaged businesses have reopened, homes are being rebuilt, and the jobs are returning. While there is still much to be done, if you find yourself passing through Ringgold on I-75, I encourage you to take exit 348 for gas, a bite to eat, or an overnight stay in Ringgold, enjoy the shops and sights in the historic downtown, and know that you are playing a part in helping this great and resilient community rebuild.

#### CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. A few hours ago, the President issued a veto threat to Cut, Cap, and Balance. While, of course, this was expected, it is still disappointing. It is disappointing because this legislation answers his demand that we on this side of the aisle offer a plan. It is also disappointing because he doesn't have a plan himself.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the last few years often called the Republicans the "party of no," but this President who ran on "hope" has become President Nope. The President doesn't know what he's for, but he certainly knows what he's against.

His opposition to Cut, Cap, and Balance includes opposition to a balanced budget amendment. He said it's not

necessary, and that lawmakers should simply do their jobs. It's ironic that a President who is so insistent on tying the hands of the private sector with onerous regulations would oppose tying the hands of politicians when it comes to spending and borrowing.

Dodd-Frank, ObamaCare, the EPA—they all restrict what Americans can and cannot do. The President wants no such restrictions on either Congress or himself. No, the only restriction-free zone he wants is Washington, D.C.

Cut, Cap, and Balance recognizes that Washington's solutions have to be long-term and permanent. Quick fixes are what got us into the position we find ourselves in; they are not what will get us out of it.

#### AN UNREALISTIC APPROACH

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, we have a President who likes to talk about polling numbers, while the President seems to completely ignore one of the most important polling numbers that the American people have spoken to, and, that is, asking the Congress of the United States to do exactly what Americans around their kitchen tables are doing this evening: figuring out a way to be able to balance that budget, to be able to fill up that gas tank, to be able to put food on the table. The very thing that 49 of our States are doing on a regular basis, balancing their budget.

Today, we have the President of the United States come out and say a balanced budget amendment is unrealistic. No, Mr. President, your approach is unrealistic. We are on an unsustainable glide path, destroying the future for our children and our grandchildren, if we fail to get our fiscal house in order. Now is the time. This is our opportunity. Cut, caps, and balance. Not cut and run, Mr. President.

This is our opportunity to set America straight, to be able to get our people back to work, and to get America moving again.

□ 1920

#### CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, we are going to discuss tonight the cut, cap, and balance bill that will come before this body tomorrow morning. I just want to express some thoughts about how desperately important I believe this bill is for America. I have seen in the media oftentimes the bill diminished. Madam Speaker, I believe this is an opportunity that is very unusual for those of

us in this body to have, where we can put this Nation on a track to fiscal sanity and where we can truly do that thing that we were sent here to do.

Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying that all financial budgets will eventually balance. No individual, no family, no business, and no government can indefinitely continue to spend more money than they take in without someone having to make up the difference. That includes the budget of the United States Federal Government. Neither Mr. Obama nor congressional Democrats can repeal the laws of mathematics.

The Federal budget of the United States Government will eventually balance, Madam Speaker. The question is whether the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and the White House will work together to balance this budget ourselves by wise policy, or national bankruptcy and financial ruin will do it for us.

From the day Barack Obama walked into the White House, he has, with breathtaking arrogance, absolutely ignored economic and financial reality. It took America the first 216 years of its existence to accumulate the debt that Barack Obama has accumulated in the short 2½-year span of his Presidency. During his short time in office, Madam Speaker, he has increased our Federal debt by nearly \$4 trillion.

Just to put that nearly \$4 trillion in new debt in perspective, let me put it this way: if all of a sudden a wave of responsibility swept through this Chamber and we stopped all deficit spending and began to pay installments of \$1 million every day to pay down the nearly \$4 trillion debt that Barack Obama has created in just 2½ years, it would take us more than 10,000 years to pay it off. And that's if we didn't have to pay one dime in interest, Madam Speaker.

But, you see, we are not paying off Mr. Obama's debt by \$1 million per day. We are going deeper into debt, more than 4,000 times that \$1 million a day every day under Mr. Obama's own submitted budget and deficit projection. Let me say that again: if we paid down the debt \$1 million a day, the debt that Mr. Obama has accumulated in his 2½ year Presidency, it would take us 10,000 years to do it. But we are not doing that. We are going deeper into debt, 4,000 times that much, every day, almost \$4 billion per day.

And then when speaking of the effort to reduce the deficit, the President has the hubris to tell conservative Republicans to take a balanced approach and to eat our peas. Madam Speaker, if there is anything more catastrophically out of balance than our Federal budget, it is the arrogance to competency ratio of this White House. We have already tried Mr. Obama's way. We have for far too long been testing Democrat economics 101; the theory, as Vice President BIDEN put it, we have to spend money to keep from going bankrupt.

Madam Speaker, when it comes to balancing our budget, Mr. Obama and the liberal media have suggested that Republicans are unwilling to address the revenue side of the equation, but that isn't true either. Just because Republicans are not willing to increase job-killing tax rates on this country doesn't mean that we don't understand the revenue side of the equation.

History and experience have demonstrated time and again that the best way to increase the amount of revenue coming into this government is to get out of the way and allow the private sector to increase the quality and number of jobs for the American people. This has historically resulted in the increased productivity and the broadening of the tax base in this amazing Nation.

And yet the President is willing to ignore that history and the reality of the amazing American economic engine and kill the goose that lays the golden eggs by raising taxes. Madam Speaker, that is like saying putting additional weight on the back of a race horse will help him win more races.

You will recall that the Democrats, when they had control of Congress, raised the debt limit six times. I so clearly remember the surreal spectacle at the time of then-majority leader of the House, STENY HOYER, leading the entire Democrat caucus in a rousing standing ovation after the debt limit was raised by \$2 trillion in 2010. We have watched as President Obama ran up a trillion-dollar deficit for the first time in history and then break that record the very next year, and then say that we would have \$1 trillion-plus deficits "for years to come."

We have watched as Mr. Obama and the administration promised that if we just allowed them to spend another \$800 billion on their stimulus package that the economy would rebound and unemployment would never go beyond 8 percent. Now, Madam Speaker, the American people have awakened, and they are tired of Democrats telling them that 2 plus 2 equals 13.

So as we now find ourselves facing the prospect of raising the debt ceiling yet again, Republicans have said the only way we are going to consent to raising the debt ceiling is if we cut spending by the same amount we increase the debt ceiling and then if we give the people and the States of this Nation the historic opportunity to adopt a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution to put this country back on the track of fiscal sanity once again, Madam Speaker.

Now, I know that Mr. Obama and the Democrats have falsely said that the balanced budget amendment is just a Republican plan to destroy Social Security and Medicare. But the truth is that the bill we will be voting on tomorrow does not cut Social Security, it does not cut Medicare, and it does not cut the compensation to our men and women in uniform by one dime. But the balanced budget amendment does



give us an honest chance of reforming and saving those programs and our country from bankruptcy in the future.

Mr. Obama and the Democrats have constantly said that we need to take a “balanced approach” and include increased taxes in the equation. But I have already said, Madam Speaker, increasing the rate of taxes will decrease the productivity of this Nation and will ultimately decrease the revenue that comes into this government. It is the economic equivalent of mixing dirt and ice cream. It is a poor recipe to embrace in the name of balance.

Madam Speaker, the truly balanced approach to this problem is a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. By passing this cut, cap, and balance bill, along with the balanced budget amendment, we have a rare opportunity, and it is one that may never come again, Madam Speaker, of doing something truly historic that will save this Nation and its people from economic ruin.

Now, if the President and the Democrats will help us do this, together we can restore hope and confidence in capital markets inside the United States and really all over the world because those markets will see in the long run that America is going to make it.

It may take 6 or 7 years to fully ratify this constitutional amendment once it is sent to the States. But we owe it to the States and to the people to give them this chance to save their Nation. In the meantime, we can work hard here to expand this economy and to balance this budget that we work with here every year so that when the amendment is ratified, we will be ready to go forward together as a Nation to embrace the greatest days we have ever seen.

However, Madam Speaker, if the Democrats and the President are not willing to give America and the American people this chance by helping Republicans pass a balanced budget amendment in this Congress, the resulting consequences will be theirs alone, and I believe the people will hold them accountable for whatever financial disaster may follow.

Madam Speaker, long ago Thomas Jefferson said: I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution. I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.

Madam Speaker, it turns out Thomas Jefferson was right the vast majority of the time, and we have been those who have seen the best of some of the principles that he espoused so long ago. How I wish his contemporaries had listened to him about the balanced budget amendment. But in this moment in history, America may get a second chance, Madam Speaker. But we may not get it again.

I don't often quote Shakespeare, but long ago he wrote in a play this quote

that I think applies to us today. He said:

“There is a tide in the affairs of men.

Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;

Omitted, all the voyage of their life

Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

On such a full sea are we now afloat,  
And we must take the current when  
it serves,

Or lose our ventures.”

□ 1930

In this time of crisis, we are also standing in a place where the tide is high and the opportunity is real for us to do something that will truly turn things around for this Nation.

Madam Speaker, this is not the Democrat Congress of last year that gave a standing ovation to a \$2 trillion increase in our debt limit. This is the Congress that was sent here by the American people to turn things around. And that starts by drawing the line on spending and saying thus far and no further and passing a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. By the grace of God, Madam Speaker, that's exactly what we're going to do.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana for such time as he may consume.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his learned words and eloquent words, quoting, Madam Speaker, Shakespeare. I'll begin by quoting Yogi Berra, that great fount of wit, wisdom, and good old American common sense. More recently, Yogi Berra said, When you come to a fork in the road, take it. We find ourselves as Americans right now certainly in a fork in the road—a fork in the road as a Nation. Either we must act boldly or some would say we face financial Armageddon. Unemployment is at 9.2 percent. Investment is down. Hiring is sluggish. The American people are anxious about where they're going to find jobs, where they're going to send their kids to school. People in southern Indiana ask me all the time what they're going to do as we fall further into the financial abyss. Our national debt is over \$14 trillion—and growing.

We know we're not in the mess because the American people are taxed too little. We're in this mess because Washington spends too darned much. And we want to address that. So, as the President stands at this fork in the road, having no plan and refusing to lead, we know that we here in Congress must lead. We must act. We must, as we say in the United States Marine Corps, we must have a bias for action. Well, that's why we put forth this Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. It's a responsible action.

I'll briefly outline its finer points. First, it cuts total spending by \$111 billion in fiscal year 2012. No changes to Social Security, no changes to Medicare, no changes to veterans' benefits. And considering the size and scope of

the massive debt crisis we face in this country, it proposes a very modest cut of \$111 billion next year—certainly a manageable down payment as we work to address this leviathan debt we face. It caps total Federal spending in the future as a portion of our economy—that is the cap component of this cut, cap, and balance plan—and brings down by the end of the decade our Federal spending to less than 20 percent as a proportion of our economy. That's the post-World War II average. Very sensible, very responsible. And then, finally, it balances our budget. It does so through a balanced budget amendment that will come up for a vote later, subject to the normal super majority requirements in each House of Congress. This works in 49 of the 50 States across this great Nation. It will work here in Washington, too. If we have the courage to pass it.

The cut, cap, and balance plan will restore confidence. It will restore confidence in investors around this world, people who are right now eyeballing this body, wondering whether or not we're going to pass a bold plan to address our financial situation and therefore maintain our high AAA credit rating. It will restore confidence in those who create jobs—the entrepreneurs, the innovators, the investors across the fruited plains whom people rely on for their family incomes. It will show them that we understand Washington has a problem, and we are prepared to address it in a very specific way.

Finally, this will calm down, this will restore confidence among those we represent. Yeah, we have a deficit in Washington. And it's not just a financial deficit. It's a leadership deficit. We need to show the American people we understand our Federal Government must balance its books, just like American families and businesses are making hard decisions and balancing their own books during this difficult time.

The President stands at this fork in the road. No plan, no action, no leadership. And he characteristically refuses to choose a path. We have laid out a path. The path is one of leadership. The path is one of choosing. I believe that to lead is to choose. We must choose. I encourage the members of this body, my esteemed colleagues, to choose the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I would now yield to the gentleman from Georgia for such time as he may consume.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Arizona and my friend from Indiana. This, to me, tomorrow, where we are today, is a monumental time in the history of this Nation. When we think about the decisions and the debate, the discussions, the rhetoric of tomorrow, it will be amazing to see who falls on which side. Because it's truly a choice. It is a decision. And we've heard that this is going to be a time of choosing. Tomorrow is the day.

We've had reckless debt and deficit for years now. It's not a necessarily Democrat problem because Republicans have also been a part of the



problem. We've seen both parties guilty in this time of fiscal nonsense, the recklessness of Washington spending. But it's come to an end. And we have an opportunity before us that I think is going to be incredible.

So, tomorrow, as the debate begins, I hope the Nation is watching. I hope the Nation is listening. I hope the Nation is witnessing their Members of Congress, whom they voted for, sent to office to represent them, watching to see how they will cast their vote. Of course, the President has already shown his cards. We know how he's going to cast his vote. I'd love to see us as a House pass it to the Senate, and the Senate move it to the President, and him look the American people square in the eye and say he is not for balancing the budget. He is not for cutting spending. He is not for capping the Federal Government. How defiant would that be to the American people?

His quote today was, We don't need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs. Mr. President, the Constitution is there to protect the American people from their government. What better opportunity to protect them from the reckless spending of Washington than a balanced budget amendment sent to the States? We do need the Constitution to tell us how to balance the budget because apparently this place can't do it on its own. Year after year after year it's been out of balance, debt limits increased, spending out of control. And yet we have a President who now, without a plan, but a framework, we hear—only through press conference, press releases, and spokespersons—a framework. Is that a plan? No, it's not a plan. We hear the Senate has a plan. It's plan B, though. Why? Because plan A comes before the House tomorrow. Plan A is to cut the Federal Government spending now. It is to cap the Federal Government's size in the future. And it is to balance the budget forevermore. That is what America is seeking right now.

So, the time truly is for choosing. And the question before us tomorrow as we all will watch the board light up, everyone will put in their voting card—they're really casting a couple of different decisions tomorrow. It's not just cut, cap, and balance, but it is: What is our vision for America. What will it be? What will America be in the future? That is the other question. I believe that those who cast that "aye" button tomorrow, the green button, they are casting their decision for a prosperous future for this country—a future in which we do live within our means, a future that ensures prosperity for the next generation. But then there are those, they'll cast a "no" vote. They'll cast the red vote. They will say, No, the status quo is acceptable. Out-of-control spending, yeah, we'll get it through it. The time will come, we will get by. Compromise is necessary. That will be the "no" vote tomorrow.

Tomorrow's vote is so big. It is big. And I thank the gentleman from Ari-

zona for leading this hour tonight because it's a precursor to the debate tomorrow—a debate that will be grand. I believe out of all the votes I've cast in my short time just over a year here, tomorrow's might be one of the most important votes I cast. And I stand before this House tonight, Madam Speaker, before you to say you I'll be casting that green vote for that prosperous future of this great Nation we have, to restore it, reclaim that liberty that we all know is so great and grand. And I look forward to joining many of my colleagues such as the gentleman from Arizona.

Thank you.

□ 1940

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I now recognize the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to speak to the words of my dear colleague from Arizona, and I appreciate that he not only quoted Shakespeare but that he also made a nautical reference to the facts of life when the tides change. As a child of the ocean, I appreciate that.

Let me just say we've all got to understand how we got where we are today. The fact is, in '06, the American people were fed up with the Republicans spending too much, not because we had raised taxes or cut taxes, but they were fed up with our spending habits. Four years later, the same voters threw out the Democrats, not because they hadn't raised taxes but because they had expanded expenditures extraordinarily. So I think, if there were one indication that we ought to understand, it's that when you navigate on the ocean you've learned to know which way the waves are coming, which way the wind is coming, and you learn from your experience that there are some things that you don't want to fight.

One is the will of the American people.

As we look around the world, everybody celebrates the Arab Spring where the average person in Arab countries is standing up and saying, Not just "no," but "hell no." We're going to stand up and say, We've had enough. What's happening there is happening in America, too. The fact is that the average citizens in America, just like around the world, now can communicate through the Internet, and no big government, big operation, big cartel can keep them from communicating. So there is an energy let loose not just in Arab countries but here in the United States that says, America, we've got to live within our budget. You're not going to tax us anymore.

Madam Speaker, I think we've got to remember that the American people saw this coming. They saw starting in '08 a spending spree of extraordinary spending that went off for 2 years. Ac-

tually, even before the new administration went in there, the American people saw that there was going to be spending done by Republicans or Democrats that was going to be used as an excuse to raise taxes, and that's why they said, We're taxed enough already. So we need to get down to the fact that we're talking about where is the credibility of this government. It has to be reinstated by the fact that we can be trusted with the budget—not trusted with raising taxes, but trusted with spending control. That is going to be the real crisis.

Notable economist Art Laffer just said recently that he almost compares what's being proposed by some in Washington to a couple going out to Monaco and then to Italy and then to France and running up a big bill and then coming back to their boss and saying, Oh, by the way, Boss, we spent all this money. We need a pay raise—or how about this: why don't you split half of the expense of my vacation with me. You pay half of it and I'll pay half of it.

That kind of logic doesn't sell when you're facing off with your employer. It darned well doesn't wash when you're facing off with your employer here in Washington, which is the American taxpayer, and I think we need to recognize that.

So, in all fairness, there are things we can do, Madam Speaker, to stimulate the economy without borrowing money from China. We can bring back almost \$2 trillion of American money to create American jobs here on American soil. Congress and the President just have to agree to do it. The money is out there. It's not being taxed, and it's not coming back if we don't eliminate the 35 percent penalty for it coming back.

Here is a place where we can invest in research and development, like the President wants, and in construction. We can go into manufacturing expansion—things for which the President and the Democrats in the past have borrowed money from China in order to create that kind of stimulus to the economy. We can create a stimulus to the economy, we can create jobs and help to balance the budget, but first we've got to understand that taxing people to death is not the answer to prosperity.

The answer for this family, called the American Nation, is just like that of every other family: living within your means, understanding your limits, spending within those limits, and not asking people to pay for your extravagances.

So as we face a lot of challenges, I've just got to say to everybody that you can look at what's going on in California today. Madam Speaker, it is a State that is controlled by the left, that has driven business out of the State, and the money now has run out. Not only did citizens lose jobs when those businesses left; but because those jobs are not there to pay the taxes, the

citizens of California, who have depended and expected to have their health care paid by the State now are being told they have to expect less because there is no more money to pay for those social benefits that they were promised—promised in such inappropriate ways. As we destroy businesses, we destroy jobs. Even those who are on public assistance will be affected by this kind of destructive behavior.

The difference between raising the debt limit today and in the past is that, in the past, all you had to do was raise the debt limit to have groups like Moody's be able to talk about addressing this issue. Fine, that's enough. Now the people who are raiding our dollar are saying, You can't just raise the limit. You've got to show us that you are serious about controlling the spending. Now this Congress has to do something that no Congress has been forced to do in the past:

We have to address the issue of the debt limit but address the issue of the debt at the same time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from California for his wise and well-placed words.

My friends on the left would have us believe that if we have a balanced budget in this country that somehow it will crush all of the critical programs for the most vulnerable in our society. Madam Speaker, that just simply is not true.

There is very little that I know of that would cause this government to flourish economically than for the Nation, itself, to flourish economically. Oftentimes, we forget that the confidence in the system has a great deal to do with the success of the system. We find that a lot of us on the right talk about the competitive free market, and we do believe in that; but I will tell you there is something that we believe in even more, and that is an element called "trust."

Of those who are the producers of our society, of those who are the job makers of our society, of those who are the captains of industry and productivity, all the way down to the person who makes minimum wage, if they believe that they can trust the environment they're in and if they do what they believe is right—that their contracts will be honored, that their wages will be paid, that government will make sure that they're treated justly and fairly—then they will continue to be productive, and they will continue to do everything that they can collectively to make this country the ongoing great Nation in the history of the world.

Madam Speaker, when that trust is broken—when government sometimes just sets aside its own rules and prints money and deficit spends and completely ignores the important things that it's supposed to do to keep trust with the people that it represents—then oftentimes those who are the producers, those who are the entrepreneurs, those who are the ones who try to make a difference in this world

become discouraged, and they step back because they can't trust their government.

I would suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that that is one of the big challenges that we face today.

People have watched over the last many decades this government continue to spend out of control. They've watched us take advantage of inflation. They've watched the government of this Nation and its leaders use deficit spending to a degree that diminishes their way of life, and they've watched us do all the bailouts and all those kinds of things. I will just tell you, Madam Speaker, that they're getting tired, but the good news is this:

The good news is that people have finally awakened.

I would say to you tonight, Madam Speaker, that nothing encourages me more than knowing that people are finally starting to watch this country. They know that a balanced budget amendment will do something that very few other economic policies have ever done: that it will restore the confidence and trust in this government, that we will begin to have to live within our means, that if we want greater revenue to come through these doors that we will do everything that we can to see business flourish, and that we will put aside this notion, as Fred Bastiat said, of government being that great fiction through which everyone endeavors to live at the expense of everyone else.

We will understand that the secret to the success of this Nation economically is productivity. Then we will have the kind of tax base that will not only support this government but that will allow us to do the things that are important for the most helpless in our society.

□ 1950

I want to yield again to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, we are really at a threshold of making decisions of: Are we willing to do what it takes to prove to the American people that this Republican form of government actually can function and address the long-term needs of America?

We're at a point to where we have to be able to show not just the American people, but to people around the world, that our Republican experiment, the Republic that we call the United States of America, can function not just for 200 years but for hundreds of years on top of that because we can make the tough decisions not just to go to war, not just to respond to disasters, but to take care of our financial well-being and that the elected representatives cannot use tax money to buy votes and cannot be bullied by scare tactics away from doing what is essential for the future of this country. That is a real test.

And remember, when we talk about Washington taking money, and I think this is one thing Republicans and Democrats don't talk enough about. I

used to be a mayor. I was a mayor in my twenties. We forget that this is not government—and I say this to my Republican colleagues. We say that too much. This is not government we're talking about, but this is Federal Government. This is totally different than your city council. This is totally different than your county commissioners or supervisors. This is not going to your school board. There, if they tax you, you can go to their meetings and you can stand up at a podium and you can tell that mayor what you think about his spending habits. You can tell the county chairman what you think. The school board member is required, by law, to hear your opinion about that.

But when your money is taken to Washington, you don't have the right to even stand up and speak to the Congress. You try to stand up without getting permission, they've got security to drag you off. There is a big difference between sending your money to city hall and sending your money to Washington, D.C. One, you are vested with rights to participate in how that money is spent. Here in Washington, you are disenfranchised except for one person, your Congressman. And that person darn well is diluted and cannot speak for you personally but has to represent you as part of a group.

So when we talk about Washington taking money, remember you've got school boards, you've got counties, you've got cities. But Washington is not just taking it away from the business community; it's taking it away from the local government agencies that provide the baseline services that are essential to all of us.

We keep talking about Washington is the great safety net. Excuse me. Your city and your counties are the great safety net of civilized services that we get into. The Federal Government, anybody that's lived in Washington, D.C., understands that, that the local government is where the essential services have gone. And when we take money out of a community and bring it here to Washington, we're depriving those same mayors and school board members and county commissioners the essential services that make every day possible for our citizens. And when we do that, even more importantly, we deprive the individual the ability to participate in how their hard-earned money is spent.

So we should take as little as humanly possible to execute the responsibilities and the mandates of the United States Constitution. And maybe if we looked around a little more and focused on the responsibilities that the Constitution gives us, Washington, D.C., as opposed to mayors, council members and State legislators, maybe if we didn't try to be everything to everyone, maybe we wouldn't be so greedy at taking so much from the citizens of the United States. So I think that that is one of those items we've got to constantly try to remember.

And I say this to my Democratic colleagues and my Republican colleagues. When we're talking about the Federal budget, we're not talking about government. We're talking about Federal Government taking these funds. And I think those are the central issues.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for sponsoring this time to talk about the importance of having Cut, Cap, and Balance. This is an historic vote that we're going to be taking in the House tomorrow. And I think that it's critical that we have a solution that will get our fiscal House in order.

Very few of the other people that are negotiating with the House leadership—I am talking about the Senate Democratic leadership, the White House, they're very short on having specific plans. I haven't really seen anything in writing, in fact. I'd love to see something in writing so we could actually do a financial analysis, a fiscal analysis of one of the other plans. But this is a way forward that many of us are looking forward to voting for tomorrow here on the floor.

And as you have been describing it, Representative FRANKS and Mr. BILBRAY of California, the elements of this plan are really wonderful for the fiscal health and the financial future and the prosperity of our country. America is a great country, and I don't want to see her go into decline. And if we don't do something, that is the prospect that we unfortunately have before us.

So I look forward to voting to cut the next year's budget by a manageable amount. Sure, there will be some people who say, Don't cut this; I'd rather you cut something else. But we have to live within our means, so we're cutting from next year's budget.

We're also capping the next 10 years so that instead of the unsustainable 24 or 25 percent spending of our gross domestic product for the Federal Government, it's going to be brought down to about 20 percent or under 20 percent. That is important for living within our means.

Historically, post-World War II, the revenues of the Federal Government have been about 18 percent, nowhere near the 24 or 25 percent. Even 19.9 percent that this calls for after, like, year six or seven is still higher than our revenues, but it's on a glide path, it's on a trajectory that gets toward balance.

And the best thing of all is a balanced budget amendment. And this is something that the minute, should it pass the House and Senate and go to the States and should the three-quarters of the States, 38 of them, pass it in their own legislatures and it becomes part of the U.S. Constitution, at that moment we will live under a balanced budget, whether that's 4 years or 8 years or 12 or however long that would

take. So this has a short-term, a medium-term, and a long-term solution for the fiscal health of our country.

Now, if others say, Well, I don't like that plan; I'm going to vote against it, I'd like to see their plan. The status quo is simply unacceptable. We are headed toward a Greece-type default and bankruptcy, and we just simply do not need to do that. So we have to reduce our spending.

Representative FRANKS, you know this as well as I do. I have watched and respect your voting record, and you're one for holding the line on extraneous spending. And that's what it takes. Every family has to do it. Every business has to do it. Every individual has to do it. When your income is not as much as your outgo, you have to reprioritize. You have to stop spending as much as you want to and you have to live within your means. Every other government in the country has to do that—cities, States, counties. They all have to do it. The Federal Government is, for some reason, the only one that's exempt from these fiscal laws of nature.

So we have this historic vote tomorrow. I'm really looking forward to voting to cut, cap, and balance our Nation's finances. And Representative FRANKS, I'm so glad that you are sponsoring this time so that we can discuss this important issue.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. With that, I would yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Just an observation here. I know our President said earlier today that we had—frankly, we don't need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs. He was referring, of course, to this debt limit debate and our insistence here in the House that we get some serious spending cuts in conjunction with that debt limit and come up with a plan to get our debt under control in the longer term.

□ 2000

My response to this idea that we don't need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs, first I look to the Constitution itself. Article V of the Constitution, the first phrase there is pretty clear. "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution."

I would say it's our duty, when we deem it necessary, to go ahead and propound constitutional amendments to solve various problems here that we think need to be addressed within our Federal Government. First, we are duty-bound to put forward such a solution. Second, history bears out many examples where institutionally or cul-

turally or historically the time has arisen for certain improvements in our way of government.

So we've put forth some fine amendments like, say, the 19th Amendment, which gave women the guaranteed right to vote. I think that's a fine thing. I think it was important that Congress put forth amendments to guarantee women's right to vote so that we would do our job. It was necessary. It was necessary to put forth that amendment, just as it's necessary to put forth a constitutional balanced budget amendment.

I guess the final thing I would say is it's necessary that we pass a constitutional balanced budget amendment as part of this Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011 because it's the only viable plan we have on the table right now. What is the President's plan to get our budget back into balance? I ask that time and again. I have not seen any sort of acceptable answer.

So we need to bind the hands of our political class. I think this Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, which my colleagues have been speaking to over recent minutes, is a very responsible direction to go, and I ask for the consideration of my friends across the aisle as well.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Oftentimes, Madam Speaker, I have friends that come up to me on the street and they say, Trent, why aren't you talking more about this? Why aren't you explaining these things in the media better? Why aren't you going to the floor and telling us about these critical issues? So, oftentimes we do and the media just ignores it or somehow the people don't have the advantage of hearing what we say.

And I hope that doesn't happen to this bill, Madam Speaker, because I truly believe if the American people could just read the Cut, Cap, and Balance legislation that they would understand how profoundly reasonable it really is. All it really says is that we are going to cut our budget at least as much as we raise the debt ceiling, and that we're going to put some steps in place to begin to rein in the spending of this government in a real way; and that as we go forward, we will begin to index the spending of this Nation with a certain percentage of the gross domestic product, or the amount of productivity of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, that's so imminently reasonable because that creates a great deal of incentive on the part of government, then, to see all people in our society successful, to see everyone have gain and to be able to accumulate wealth in every way that they can, from the janitor to the Senator.

And then, finally, this legislation says that we need a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of being the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution in this place. I will just suggest to you that the balanced budget amendment seems

so intuitive to me because, as I said earlier, all budgets have to balance at some point.

You know, I have two little babies, Joshie and Gracie, and they have piggy banks. They know that if they take more out of it than they put in it, then it goes empty. They understand that. I don't know why something so fundamental and basic escapes the erudite minds that pervade government. But it seems that we think that somehow because we have Ph.D.s and that because we are able to perpetrate monotonous polysyllabic obfuscation, semantic gymnastics, and verbal circumlocution that people won't know what we're talking about and that somehow we can get away with anything that we want to. And I just think that's so tragic because a reality is still in place that says that if we live outside our means, that pretty soon the entire system begins to collapse. That's where we are, Madam Speaker. We are seeing people losing confidence in their government. And I'm very concerned about that because I believe that it is vital that people have confidence.

Somebody said to me, they said, you know, if all of the gold in Fort Knox were stolen tonight and none of us knew about it, that the gold market wouldn't change much tomorrow morning in *The Wall Street Journal*. But if someone put out a press release, say, from Fort Knox that all of the gold had been stolen in Fort Knox but that that wasn't really true, that all of the gold was still there but somehow the public believed that it had been stolen, that gold markets across the planet the next day would crash because people's perception, their confidence in the system is vital to the system.

Right now, people are losing confidence in our system, and I think there are very few things that threaten us more. We talk about a default. Well, the default is not going to happen on August 2 unless the President chooses to arbitrarily force that to happen. But I am concerned that the markets may begin to say, Maybe the Congress of the United States just doesn't have the courage to do the right thing. Maybe somehow they're going to let politics intervene to the extent that they're actually going to step back and not do what's necessary to stabilize the economic foundation of this Nation. And that is so tragic because it doesn't have to be that way.

This Cut, Cap, and Balance bill can accomplish everything that's reasonable. It can say, okay, we recognize the challenges that we face in this country today. We recognize that we've overspent. We recognize that our country is at a low economically. We recognize that we're not working on full employment. We recognize that the markets don't know whether to jump or go blind. They don't know what this President is going to do next. And if we put this Cut, Cap, and Balance bill in place, all of a sudden, the markets of the world, the person on the street,

they're going to realize, hey, maybe there is hope after all. Maybe America is going to go forward and do what she was destined to do from the born of time and continue to be that great city on a hill that Ronald Reagan spoke of. I believe that it can be that way.

But I am afraid that somehow the people won't understand what's in this bill. I will just suggest to you, in all due deference and respect to the President of the United States, his plan is incumbent upon the people not understanding what it is, and the Republican plan is incumbent upon the people understanding what is really in the bill. And I so hope that the people are able to truly get the information that they need to understand what this bill is all about, rather than letting the left-wing media distort it to the extent that they don't know.

I also hope for something else, Madam Speaker. I am hoping that tomorrow when we vote that we will recognize something else as people in this place: that all too soon we will step from these Chambers one by one and that our time here will be passed, and only those things that we did that truly honored our God and our country and our fellow human beings and the great gift that we've been given in America will really matter at that point. I hope we will realize that we won't have too many votes like this in our career that can make a difference for future generations.

It's been said that the politician looks to the next election; whereas, the statesman looks to the next generation, and that great societies finally come when old men plant trees under whose shade they will never sit. I hope tomorrow that we will embrace this thing called statesmanship and look to the next generation and, quite frankly, Madam Speaker, to look to the next few days and weeks, because what we do is going to send a message to the markets the world over.

If you are an investor and you saw a company that continued to deficit spend and continued to get in debt beyond its means and continued to carelessly spend, would you invest in that company? I think that's what our country has to ask ourselves.

I truly believe that we're going to have a chance tomorrow that may be very unique in our careers, and it's possible that a lot of people are going to succumb to the need to be popular among certain special interest groups. But I will just suggest to them, Madam Speaker, that popularity is history's pocket change. It's courage that is the true currency of history, and we have a chance to be courageous tomorrow. We have a chance to do what's right, to stabilize this country today and tomorrow. We have a chance to make sure that our future generations walk in the light of freedom. I have a chance, as a father, to do what I believe is truly right for my children and their contemporaries so that they might grow up and walk in the light of freedom, as I have.

□ 2010

If we do this, I believe the people will applaud us in the long run. There may be certain exceptions in the short term. But in the long run they will look back and say that those people who stood up and did what was right that day when they voted on cut, cap, and balance and voted for the balanced budget amendment, they'll look back and see that as a historic turning point in this country. And I want so much to see that happen.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would just say to you again that all budgets do balance, and the equation before us today is, are we going to balance the budget, or is reality going to balance it in a horrifying way for us?

For the sake of my children, for the sake of future generations, and for the sake of all that we love and hold dear in this country, and for the sake of making sure that we are good stewards of the greatest Nation God has ever given to this planet, I hope we do the right thing tomorrow.

I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my colleague from Arizona.

He said a couple of things that I would like to pivot off of. They certainly struck a chord with me. First, the notion that markets deal with perception, as opposed to always reality. I thought it was a brilliant example of Fort Knox, should the gold be taken, the press release versus the actuality of that gold being taken.

It reminded me of a conversation I had just today on the airplane as I headed backed to Washington from my southern Indiana district. I was sitting next to someone who dealt in the financial markets, and I asked him a fairly pointed question. I said, you know, the media, in recent days, in recent weeks, has really sort of ratcheted up attention, even anxiety with respect to the debt limit debate and whether or not the debt ceiling is, in fact, going to be raised, what is going to be attached to a debt ceiling vote.

And I certainly understand this. I take this vote very seriously and have factored into my calculus of voting for and against various measures, the interest rate response we might see.

But the funny thing is there hasn't really been much of an interest rate response. For all the hemming and hawing about what might happen should we not raise the debt ceiling by August 2, there hasn't been an interest rate response. And I find that amazing.

And so I asked my friend why he thought that was, and he put forth one idea. He said certainly, TODD, that these are complicated matters, and there are all different things that factor into them. But in his professional opinion, one reason was that we finally have a group of people in Washington that are taking very seriously this notion we ought not spend more money than we bring in. That's pretty powerful.

I'm proud, as a new Representative, to be part of this group of people supporting the cut, cap, and balance measure that would bring our spending under control. So we ought to be proud. That's an early victory. The markets, at least, believe we are serious about getting this spending under control. I hope we can play this out and prove that we are serious.

The other thing that my colleague from Arizona said that struck a chord with me was this notion that statesmen look not just to the next election, they look to the next generation.

There was a group of people back 150 years ago that entered politics. It was around the 1850s, and they entered politics certainly looking to the next generation. It was their belief that every man, woman, and child should be entitled to the fruits of their labor. They weren't partisans. In fact, they were Know-Nothings. They were independents, some Democrats. They came together with this notion, though, that everyone should be entitled to the fruits of their labor.

Well, when we continue to spend money we don't have, oftentimes on things we don't need, and kick the debt forward another year, another 5 years, another 10 years, another generation or two down the road, ladies and gentlemen, we are committing the fruits of the next generation's labor to pay off our current debt.

Madam Speaker, I think this is wrong. I think this cut, cap, and balance plan is a viable plan, a specific plan to stop this practice so that everyone, my four children, everyone else's grandchildren and great grandchildren, will not be paying off our future debts.

So again, I urge consideration and support of this cut, cap, and balance plan. And for those who are unable to support it, I would ask them to put forth a specific plan of their own, one that will get our spending under control and put this Nation back on the right fiscal course.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, let me just close with these thoughts. There are a lot of people that have sacrificed profoundly for this Nation. There are people lying out in Arlington National Cemetery tonight, and I wonder what their perspective would be if they could come back among us for just a few moments?

While none of us knows that, Madam Speaker, I would suggest to you that they didn't die so that we could spend our country into bankruptcy, so that we could weaken our Nation on all fronts simply because we weren't fiscally responsible. And they didn't die so that we could put ourselves so deeply in debt that we spent tens of thousands for each little child born today so that they would have to carry that the rest of their lives.

They wanted, as the Founding Fathers talked about, to see every person, not only in America but, ultimately, in the world, to be able to be born and to

lay hold on the miracle of life and to be free and to pursue their dreams. That's what they wanted. Sometimes I am so afraid that we have gotten away from that vision to the extent that we've grown sort of callous and cynical.

I hope that we can revisit those ideals tomorrow, and that we can force ourselves to remember that all of history and all of the future is watching us, and that what we do here tomorrow could mean the difference for America for decades and generations to come.

I believe if we do the right thing, that the loneliest moments in an old age home will be livable because we'll look back and say, you know, that's what we did. We did the right thing. And I hope we do that for the sake of my children, for the sake of America's children, and for the sake, somehow, of the children throughout the world that can be still touched by the message of this, the greatest Republic in the history of humanity.

Madam Speaker, if we will protect our constitutional foundations, if we will protect our economic base, if we will protect those things that make us who we are, then I believe that this government will have all of the revenue that it needs. I believe we will continue and go forward to be more productive than we have ever been, and I believe that America still has great things in the world to do. I hope we make sure that that occurs.

With that, with great respect, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2560, CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE ACT OF 2011

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Mr. FRANKS of Arizona) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-150) on the resolution (H. Res. 355) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2560) to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be here this evening once again with my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues to talk about the need for jobs, jobs, and more jobs, and how we ought to be dealing with the debt limit and our debt crisis. Let me begin with jobs. That's not a new topic for the Congressional Black Caucus, because our communities unfortunately have a long-term and intractable history of unemployment.

Every year that I have been here, and I'm sure for the 40 years of our exist-

ence, job creation has been a priority, and that includes summer jobs for our young people, something we still have not been able to get the Congress to recognize and fund as critical to the well-being of our young people and our communities. In this Congress alone, CBC members have introduced more than 30 job-creating pieces of legislation, and we've cosponsored many, many more introduced by our Democratic colleague.

Need I remind you that the Republican leadership has still, today, done nothing to create one job. Meanwhile, unemployment remains a crisis in our country, and in the African American community it's a catastrophe.

And where is the patriotism of our corporations who are sitting on billions of dollars and still not hiring? I would say that if there is uncertainty in that sector, the corporate sector, welcome to the club.

As the gentleman from Arizona said, lack of confidence. But the cause of this lack of confidence in the corporate sector, in the banking sector and on Wall Street has got to do more with the gridlock, I think, that's caused by the Republican leadership who won't even consider the balanced approach that the President is asking us to take. And all this time the rest of the world is looking at us, watching this sorry mess that we're calling governing. I can't imagine that our allies in those countries around the world that look to us for leadership have much confidence in us either right now.

I am pleased to be joined this evening, Madam Speaker, by several of my colleagues, but I'd like to begin first to yield such time as he might consume to a reverend, to the former mayor of Kansas City, now our distinguished leader of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman EMANUEL CLEAVER.

□ 2020

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, let me first of all express appreciation to Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN, for how she has put forth boundless energy making sure that we keep this issue of joblessness in front of us.

Let me first of all say that I did two interviews during the votes today, one with ABC News. And as I stood before the cameras they showed me two comments, one from a gentleman who said that he was so disgusted with Congress because nothing is being done and he believed that we needed to start trying to deal with the problems. He thought that we should not be raising the taxes on what he called "ordinary" people or low-income working people.

The other interview I did was on Fox and was an interview where I was interviewed about the joblessness among African Americans. I think both of those intersect. And the reason for this is, I said to people that as a Democrat I was embarrassed that during the last session of Congress we failed to listen to the American public. The public said they were interested in jobs.

I would go home to my district in Kansas City, Missouri, and people would simply talk about the need for jobs. I would come back to Washington, and the only thing we talked about was health care. And health care was important, I supported it—it was not the bill that I wanted, but I supported it anyway. And many of us supported it because of the way in which you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, as a physician, presented us with how valuable it would be. But the point is we never, ever dealt with jobs. We are now into our 194th day into this Congress, and I am sorry and I am embarrassed that we have not created one single job.

African American unemployment is at 16.2. If you use what the Labor Department uses to factor real unemployment—it's called U-6—the U-6 unemployment for African Americans is at 30 percent. This is higher than the Depression. The 1929 fall of Wall Street created unemployment that devastated not only this country, but the entire world.

I am saying here on the floor—in this sacred well—that African American unemployment is at a crisis level. Why would that be important to somebody who's not African American or who lives in a community where there are no African Americans? Well, in the first place, we ought to be concerned about all Americans, period. And the day that I am not concerned with all Americans, I want that to be my last day in this body. I would say at this point that the congressional district from which I come is only 18 percent African American, but the people of good will in my district understand that all Americans should have equal access to jobs.

There are a plethora of reasons for the African American unemployment being so high—I won't get into all of them—but I want to tell you that if we had unemployment among any group in America, whether they were news anchors, whether they were comedians, no matter what the group, I think that this country would be in a crisis mode. We would have commissions; we would have the top economists and labor experts becoming involved, trying to figure out how can we erase or reduce the level of unemployment among this particular group. Now unemployment is at 9.2 percent with all Americans. That is unacceptable in the most powerful, industrialized, technologically advanced Nation on this planet; 9.2 is unacceptable, 16.2 is sinful, it is sinful in this country. I believe that we have got to figure out ways in which we can get something done.

One of the gentlemen said during the pre-interview with me that he believed, to quote him exactly, that "Congress is broke." It pains me, I've got to tell you, that I think he is right. I think it is a broken body, but the public has participated. The public is culpable as well, and that is this, we have people who run thermonuclear campaigns. And instead of public people saying

anybody who would run a nasty campaign is going to be nasty when they get in office, so I'm not going to vote for him or her, but that's not what the public says. They cheer, they rah-rah this negativity on.

And the people who run the nasty campaigns on both sides end up in this body, and they just simply escalate it with more publicity. And until the United States citizenry comes to the conclusion that they are sick and tired of what's going on and begin to punish people for being nasty, it's going to get worse and worse and worse.

I would love to be able to some day close my eyes, fall asleep among the elders, and believe before I go that the United States of America will present to my children—and their children and even their progeny—a state that has opened up opportunities to everyone and a state where the government works. We cannot get anything done because anybody who raises their head and presents something, if they belong to the wrong party, they're not going to get recognized and nothing is going to get done. Republicans do it; Democrats do it. It's wrong no matter who does it.

What we are facing right now is a situation that is grave, and I don't even think the Republican nor Democratic Parties in this body understand that we can't simply go as we are going. We're talking about the debt ceiling. It has to be raised. It is absolutely ridiculous to say that we shouldn't raise it. I sit in my apartment across the street from the Capitol at night looking at television and listening to people who know better say that it's all right, it's no problem, we can let the debt ceiling remain under the \$14.3 trillion and nothing cataclysmic will happen. And they know better. I would feel a lot better if people would say something and really meant it because they didn't know better. But they do know better, but many in the public don't, and so they think there's no big deal.

Look, if we don't raise the debt ceiling, we can pay 60 percent of our debts, but we've got to make some concrete choices on who gets that 60 percent. And no matter who gets it, it will create a cataclysm for the United States and perhaps the entire world. Italy, Spain, Greece and Ireland are already in trouble in Europe. And they don't have central banks like we have. We have the Federal Reserve, and so to some degree we can go out and have an auction of Treasury notes and bring in revenue; they don't. But if we end up having a very, very serious economic problem in this country, it's going to trigger a world-wide recession. Nobody wins. Nobody comes out on top if this happens. And the unemployment numbers, 9.2, they are going to rise.

I don't want people looking at this tonight or any of my colleagues believing that those are my numbers or that I am the only one who believes there is going to be trouble. Ben Bernanke, re-appointed by George Bush, says that if

we make deep cuts in the U.S. budget, it is going to create a problem because right now the only money that is going into the U.S. economy, into the GDP, into the economic activity is coming from the United States Federal Government.

And if you begin to cut back drastically, it cannot help but raise the unemployment numbers. And if we fool around and fail to raise the debt ceiling or just walk to the cliff, walk to the edge, walk to the precipice, the bond rating agencies, who have already warned us—and these are not Democratic bond rating agencies, these are not Congressional Black Caucus bond rating agencies, these are not Republican bond rating agencies, they are the bond rating agencies of the United States of America—and they tell us when we're in trouble and they tell us when we're in good stead. And they have said to us, if you walk to the precipice, we are going to end up getting in trouble because they're going to downgrade our bond rating. What does that mean?

□ 2030

Well, it means that the interest rates are going to rise. China is our number one creditor, external. Most people think that we owe more money to foreign governments than we owe anyplace else, which is not true. The majority of the debt is held by citizens of the United States. China is number one outside the country, and then Japan. Well, China has no other place to make investments, so that's to our advantage. Japan has nowhere else to make investments. That's to our advantage. But they are going to say to us, Look, you guys are not paying your bills, and if you're not going to pay your bills, it is a greater risk to us.

And what happens when there's a greater risk? We're going to raise your interest rates. So if the interest rates are raised on the United States, they're going to be raised in all of the banks and anyplace else where we seek credit. That is going to create a problem.

I don't understand how and why we have allowed all of this false information to go out about how this will not matter and nothing is going to happen. It has nothing to do with the facts. It has to do with the partisanship. It has to do with partisanship. And in this town, in this place, we allow ideology to trump everything. Everything falls second to ideology.

I don't understand how anybody could come to this place and say, I come here so that I won't have to compromise. You have to compromise. There's not a person in the world who has been married for any length of time who doesn't understand the word "compromise." If they don't understand word "compromise," then they understand the word "divorce."

And so what we've got to understand here is that we're going to divorce this Nation—one side red, one side blue, one side left, one side right—and we can't



get anything accomplished as a consolidated Nation.

Let me just say a couple of other things, and I'm through, Madam Speaker, and, that is, if I can go back to the jobs issue just for a moment. We know that only 18,000 jobs were created in the United States last month. We need probably 233,000 jobs each month to be created in the United States. Why? Because that's about the number of new employees or people seeking work who come into the work market, so we've got to constantly create jobs.

People who were laid off work 3 or 4 years and haven't found work, if the economy broke tomorrow and we were allowed to begin to see hiring in the major corporations, the 10 employees who were laid off 3 or 4 years ago would now be three or four employees called back to work. Why? Because technology is constantly growing and advancing, and where we needed 10 line workers 3 or 4 years ago, we only need two or three workers today, which means that we've got to educate the workforce.

What does that mean to the country? Well, if we don't educate the workforce in the United States, it means that the imbalance of trade with other countries is going to rise, because other nations are going to be able to provide what we can't provide and they're going to do it at a lower cost. We've got to have a workforce that can compete with China and India and Japan and Indonesia and Vietnam, because if we don't, American corporations are going to continue to try to do business abroad.

We cannot ignore the fact that a lot of those jobs, positions, were held by African Americans, and they need to be retrained. We need to retool the U.S. workforce. Let me tell you why we have some numbers that are disproportionate with African Americans, because I don't want people doing what has been done in this country for the last 400 years. Some people assume, well, you know, the African American numbers are high because African Americans don't want to work. We've heard all of that unfortunately over the years. The only reason we know what the numbers are is because those are the individuals who are out seeking work, who have gone to the unemployment agencies in their States, and that's how we know that the unemployment numbers are what they are.

But keep in mind, and nobody probably thinks about this. Every time you read about a State laying off workers, a municipality laying off firefighters or police officers, or if you find any government agency laying off, it means that the number of African Americans who are unemployed will rise, and the reason for that is that African Americans disproportionately seek work in the government. We've done it historically because it was always believed that if you could work for the government, the chances are less likely for you to be discriminated against, so we

have a large number of African Americans who work for the government.

You see all of these State layoffs all over the country, and I want people to realize when you see those numbers, please understand that a disproportionate number of them are African American.

Now, while we are here fiddling instead of trying to deal with some real problems in this country, there are people with real problems. People who don't have a job, they have a problem. I'm willing to compromise. I've talked about others who won't. I will. I'm willing to compromise. I've already compromised.

My father turned 89 years old last Friday. Thank God. Glory. Hallelujah. I'm happy. He's in great condition, probably better physical condition than me—doctor, I'm going to do better—and my uncle, who is 87. I'm thrilled and fortunate and blessed that they have this kind of longevity in the Cleaver line. But I'm not ever, ever going to compromise on one aspect, and that is Social Security.

My father has worked since he was a kid. His brother has worked since he was a kid. For me to ever support reducing the benefits for somebody who paid into Social Security—this is not some kind of giveaway program. Everybody in this country who paid the payroll tax paid into Social Security, and in their sunset years, they deserve the opportunity to live as decently and in as healthy an environment as possible. And so I'm not going to compromise on Social Security, at least on the benefits.

I will compromise if we raise the age at which people can qualify, 10 years down the road. I will compromise on lifting the cap on \$106,000. Right now if you earn above \$106,000, you will pay Social Security taxes only on the amount under \$106,000. So you can make 6 gazillion dollars and never pay Social Security taxes on but about \$105,000, which I think is actually silly.

Those of us who have been blessed to earn more than \$106,000 should understand how fortunate we are, and so we should pay above the cap. It's wrong. It's not right for people who earn a meager salary to have to struggle when there are people making \$106,000 and not even paying Social Security tax.

I am representing Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, and I want to focus some attention before I close, Madam Speaker, on a tragedy occurring in Missouri and the entire Midwest region, for that matter. Currently, farmland and homes are underwater along the Missouri River, from Montana to my home State of Missouri. Record snowmelt runoff this spring along with unexpected record rainfall in the upper river basin filled up the reservoirs in eastern Montana and the Dakotas and word is the Army Corps of Engineers plans to release large amounts of water from the reservoirs to keep them from overflowing. That excess water has flowed down-

stream, creating a path of destruction in its wake.

Levees have been breached in Iowa, Nebraska and in my home State in northwest Missouri, causing flooding of farmland, road closures including Interstate 29, and evacuations. More than 500,000 acres of land have been flooded in the seven States along the river. The high waters have moved eastward and further downstream in Missouri, causing high water and flooding in Ray, Saline and Carroll Counties.

□ 2040

I have gone to those areas. I have seen the flooding. I have looked at the fields that farmers would normally have corn growing in underwater. If we are here in Washington twiddling our thumbs, and the farmers in Missouri and other States, for that matter, are struggling just to make it—and with rivers still running above flood stage and soil saturated, forecasters have predicted this summer flooding season could rival the worst in U.S. history. That means what was called the "Great Flood of 1993" during my term as mayor, cost about \$25 billion in damage—this would exceed \$25 billion.

The excessive high temperatures sweeping across the Nation this week cannot erase concerns about river flooding. These high river levels are not going away any time soon, and neither is the risk of flooding. There will be sustained high water along the Missouri River through August as the reservoirs continue releasing high volumes of water. Due to this high water and saturated soil, just a small amount of rain could trigger more flooding in areas that have already seen record flooding in 2011.

Obviously, we cannot plan for every natural disaster. However, we have the responsibility to take preventive measures whenever possible. The original purpose of these upper Missouri basin dams was flood protection. Over the years other priorities may have slipped in. However, I believe now is the time to reevaluate the Corps of Engineers management plans and once again place the safety and livelihood of people who live and work along the river first.

Reservoir levels need to be lowered between October and April so fewer releases are needed during the spring rain season. A goal of targeted releases should be that they not exceed any given flood stage downstream. And, if releases above flood stage levels are required, then a maximum flow of no more than 5 feet over given flood stages for no longer than 15 consecutive days could be set, followed by 5 consecutive days below given flood states. This cycle could be repeated as necessary and would reduce downstream damages. This or other contingency planning is needed to prevent flooding events such as this year's from happening again.

Madam Speaker, we are here dealing with political—I think "shenanigans"



is a word that would fit. People out in the country, the real people, are struggling. Whether it is from flooding or unemployment, they are struggling, and the Congress of the United States needs to act.

You know, one of the reasons we can't get anything done with jobs, as I mentioned earlier, or the flooding problem, is this bickering based on political affiliation. Here is one thing I learned. I am always watching Animal Channel and the Discovery Channel. My family always makes fun of me. But I learned something a few years ago watching the Discovery Channel. Bees cannot sting and make honey at the same time. They either have to become stingers or honey makers. What has happened here is we have become stingers, and, therefore, we are not making any honey or laws to help the American public.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Chairman CLEAVER, and thank you for making it so very clear to those listening this evening what the real situation is in this country and how important it is for us to act to help the American people.

You have heard Reverend and Chairman CLEAVER talk about the job situation and the floods and other challenges the American people are facing. And now to add insult to injury, instead of passing a clean increase to the debt ceiling, as we have done in the past, our country and our good credit is being held hostage by Republicans, pushed by their tea party members, who demand drastic and deep spending cuts, cuts beginning in the last quarter of this calendar year, against the advice of some of our most expert economists in this country.

The cuts in this new Cut, Cap, and Balance Act that we heard the talking points on this weekend and tonight, as our Budget ranking member VAN HOLLEN has said, put more Americans out of work while this country is still recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression.

In the earlier hour, we heard a lot about Republican leadership, but I think they are leading us down the wrong path, the wrong path for this country and for most Americans. That bill, which will be on the floor tomorrow, would cap spending at the levels in the Republican budget that are below 2008 spending levels. It would make it near impossible, if not impossible, to make the investments that we need in education and health care, in research and infrastructure to secure our future. And it would still, with all of that, extend even more tax cuts to special interests. All it would do is hamstring our Nation's growth at a time when we are falling behind. It is not going to help to restore confidence, as the gentleman from Arizona said. Only lifting the debt ceiling will do that.

I have heard my colleagues say that the bill on the floor tomorrow will protect Social Security, Medicare, and

veterans payments, but I am not too sure about that because the cuts and the caps that they will impose are likely to lead us down a primrose path, with no way to fund those programs later on, causing us to have to renege on our promises to our seniors, our veterans, who have protected us, have been willing to make the sacrifices to protect the freedoms we enjoy.

Also targeted in that bill tomorrow, or subject to the caps, are SNAP, or food stamps, at a time when their policies are leaving more of America's families and especially their children hungry. It would include cuts to unemployment when we should really be adding 14 more weeks of unemployment, as the bill that BARBARA LEE has, as H.R. 589 would do. It would be cutting school lunches when sometimes that is the only meal that some children have that is really balanced.

It would cut college loans and Pell Grants, as though we are trying to go back to a time we don't want to go back to when only the wealthy could afford a college education. We cannot move our country forward by denying education to so many of our people. And all of this without letting those tax cuts expire and continuing to let some of the wealthiest in our country go without paying their fair share of taxes. The Cut, Cap, and Balance Act is not the way to go. Lifting the debt ceiling, doing it without having it being held hostage to cuts and bills like this balanced budget amendment, is what we should be doing.

At this time I would yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, who always comes with a lot of information and words of wisdom and inspiration.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I would like to thank the manager and chairwoman of this particular hour, sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus, and for those of us who care, along with many of our members in the Congressional Black Caucus and in this Congress, I think it is important to note for our colleagues that there are many Members who truly believe in their heart that we can find a common path, a bipartisan path, and are in angst, if you will, because they want to represent their constituents in the best way possible in what seems to be the tyranny, in some instances, of the majority.

□ 2050

Frankly, I do believe in the democratic process. I believe that if you are a victor in elections, you have the right to define your agenda and to present it to the American people. But there's some instances where the American people call upon us to have those agendas set aside so that we can work for America.

So I want to thank the gentle lady for her great work on the Affordable Care Act. We are beginning to see many who never had access to health care begin to be, if you will, the beneficiaries of

preventative care, the parity with mental health issues, more health professionals that we work so hard on in the Congressional Black Caucus, and of course, access to health care for those with preexisting disease.

But I want to talk tonight to reiterate some points that were made about the double-digit unemployment among African Americans and the 36 percent unemployment among youth and just make the point to the American people, to my colleagues, that no jobs bill has been put forward by our Republican friends, absolutely no job bill. This is now July 18. A supermajority is on the other side. They could do so much alone, without any votes from Democrats. Democrats have been pushing for a jobs bill.

The Congressional Black Caucus will be leaving out in a couple of weeks to visit cities all over America to not only say we care but to talk about jobs. This summer we were going to close city pools and community centers in Houston, with temperatures of 100, 105 degrees. I felt if we couldn't find public moneys, let's work to find private moneys. We were able to open over 10 to 15 community centers and pools in my congressional district.

For me it was being able to find resources, meaning that some came forward to give the resources, but, more importantly, it created jobs for youth who could be, if you will, lifeguards. As I visited these pools and talked to young people who would not have had a job, obviously a small measure, but to at least acknowledge the desperation that we have for jobs. As we go out as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, we'll be embracing corporate leadership and others to have job fairs so that individuals can have it. Just a summer or two ago, I had a job fair in the teeming heat and thousands showed up, so much so that people were lined around the block.

Americans want to work. And in a bipartisan partnership, wouldn't it have been just great for Republican colleagues, no matter whether they're a tea party or no party, to come together and say the first act that we will engage in will be creating jobs. And out of that job creation comes growth. We've done a great job under President Obama, and we in the Democratic Party have done a great job. We've actually been creating private sector jobs every single month, and as well we did create 3 million jobs under the American Recovery and Reinvestment. That should be very clear.

And the loss of numbers or the bump in unemployment is, as our colleague indicated, for all of America, was because public sector jobs were being willy-nilly dispensed with—front liners, first responders, sanitation workers, teachers, firefighters, ambulance drivers—all over America by Republican Governors. They laid the people off en masse. In many instances, they didn't need to. There could have been ways to work it out. But they laid

them off en masse, and that gave the bump to the unemployment.

But where does that lead us today? And what I want to focus on is the fact that I want to make it very clear that members of the Congressional Black Caucus have supported many bipartisan efforts to turn our economy right side up. We have worked on infrastructure issues. We have supported transportation legislation to fix America's bridges, highways, dams, because we know how important it is. We have helped resolve our budgetary issues, our revenue issues. We have voted in unison in a bipartisan way for some legislation that may not have been in total agreement with many of our views but we did it for America. We voted for a balanced budget amendment that generated the Children's Health Insurance Program. And we need to continue to discuss this, where we are today, because we need to help the American people. And I've heard the concerns of my constituents.

Today, I was at an announcement of the use of neighborhood stabilization funds, where we work with Habitat for Humanity and open the door of houses for those who weren't ever able to have a house. Oh, you should have seen the excitement of those families. But the seniors there were asking me: Are we going to get our Social Security check?

You can't go anywhere in your district where people are not up in fury. They want to know how we can get this done.

I think it's important to note a little bit of history. Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the Federal Government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I and the growth of this Nation, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements. That's where this came from. This is not a Democratic idea. This is not the idea of President Barack Obama.

To address this need, the debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the Federal Government to be the umbrella on a rainy day, to come to the aid of Americans during emergencies, to be able to address the question of war and peace. This wasn't something we developed just to agitate Members who believe they are the fiscal hawks of all time, even more so than President Reagan, who understood that the government had certain roles.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress increased it over a hundred times. In fact, it was raised 10 times in the past decade, which includes the era of President George Bush and the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February of 2010, and it did so with the idea that we were working together.

We understand that we are at \$14-plus trillion. There's no one who is happy

with a growing debt. But many economists will tell you that a deficit is sometimes important to take care of a country's people. Who knows what is going on in Japan right now because they need to take care of their people. They need to ensure that those who are impacted by the tsunami and the earthquake and the nuclear implosion can be taken care of—the sick people, the displaced people. And when I say not knowing what's going on, we know that they are growing a deficit.

But our country is not like Portugal and Greece, and economists that we listened to 2 weeks ago said on the record that this Nation is not broke. Let me say it again, Americans. Don't be intimidated and frightened to believe that America is broke. We can solve this problem. The way in which we are able to address it, the assets that we have, will allow us to extend the cuts over a 12-year period. Every reasoned economist in America says you cannot cut our spending overnight; you cannot cut it. So Congress is entirely within its right to be thoughtful on this issue of the debt.

And it is also important to note that what makes us so strong is we have something called United States Treasury bonds, which have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or an investor can make. And other countries, including Americans, buy Treasury bonds. Our children are given Treasury bonds. For foreign nations and investors purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. This is constitutionally worded.

And so my friends who are drawn to the tea party are suggesting that we go straight to the brink. But when you go to the brink, as my colleague has said, you begin to shake the markets. They begin to shudder. And the impact comes to the hardworking American who has been so fiscally responsible that they have put away savings for their children's college, savings for themselves if they retire. They have been dutiful. They have been respectful. But what we will do is force this market to get so shaky that those savings may be jeopardized.

□ 2100

How can we do this—the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Tea Party? If it's a registered party or a group of people, if there are members who have come here wearing the banner, they can do nothing more than adhere to that.

So we are here on the floor tonight to look for compromise and reason and to say, in turn, with the proceeds from the bonds that the Federal Government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. That's us, the United States.

Let me remind everyone we have the largest economy in the world. America is not broke. We have to do better. We

have to extend our cuts. We have to balance over a period of time, almost like a household, where they begin to try to analyze what they'll be able to pay and what they'll have to cut out. You've heard families say, We've stopped going out as much as we've gone out. There are unemployed persons who have to make more devastating cuts and go into their savings. That's why I say: Where is the jobs bill that the Republicans are supposed to put on the floor of the House? Where are the jobs? Somebody used to say in an advertisement: "Where's the beef?"

So this week, my friends, we're going to be spending a whole week addressing the question of a bill called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Before I just address to you who will be hurt on Cut, Cap, and Balance—it's a balanced budget amendment that came out of the Judiciary Committee of which I'm a member—I just want you to know that every State can stand up here and say that, but I want to put it on the record that it has come to my attention that:

Social Security beneficiaries in Texas, 3,440,442, likely will be impacted. The total number of Social Security beneficiaries in Harris County—that's where Houston, Texas is, which is the fourth largest city in the Nation and is a very diverse city—is 429,760, which might include SSI, which is for those who are in need of moneys because of their children or they're disabled. There are 780,000 seniors and individuals with disabilities in the metro area who are currently enrolled in Medicare—the lifeline of our seniors—and there are currently 145,000 individuals in the district, the 18th Congressional District, who are on Medicaid. It's interesting to note that the Medicaid issue has not even been discussed.

So here we have a week of Cut, Cap, and Balance. Frankly, the Treasury bond is in jeopardy. The marketplace of innocent, hardworking Americans who have saved and invested in those bonds, who owe nations around the world, who bought what they thought was a rock-solid investment are now teetering because we're willing to take this week to discuss a bill called Cut, Cap, and Balance, which the President of the United States has already indicated that he intends to veto, and there's a question of whether or not the Senate will even address this bill. So we will spend our time wasting and debating so that someone can get a political mark.

Let me express my understanding of Members who need a political mark: I voted for a bill that will never pass and could never be a useful tool in the United States. You can go home, as you bang your chest, and suggest, I showed them. I told them what it was. I voted for the Cut, Cap, and Balance.

By the way, there is no doubt that this will possibly pass, because Republicans have a supermajority, but do you know what this is? This is playing political chicken. Who will blink? We have never played political chicken

with the raising of the debt ceiling. We have never put the American people in this jeopardy. We didn't do it to Ronald Reagan. We didn't do it to Jimmy Carter. We didn't do it to the first George Bush, a distinguished Texan. We didn't do it to President, as I said, Carter. We didn't do it to President Clinton. We didn't do it to President Bush, who was just in office, but here we are with President Barack Obama now at a time that we think we have to do this. This is based upon an ideological view that does not look to the American people.

So let me tell you who is hurt in all of this so that we can understand real people are involved. I'll just call this "working Americans" and this little one who will represent millions of children across America. This is who this will impact.

In the State of Texas, our Governor has already cut \$4 billion from education. He actually took the stimulus money that was supposed to be for education. Governor Rick Perry decided to just snatch the moneys away and put it in a rainy day fund. It looks good when you're going to run for higher office to show off that you saved money. You haven't saved any money. You took the money out of the children's mouths. You're closing schools. You're closing school districts. You're taking away teachers. You're building up the class sizes. You're making our country second and third class in education while other countries are moving forward. So that's who we'll hurt.

Just take this little one who is not yet in school. This is a hardworking nurse, who represents working Americans. This is who will be hurt because, on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill, though they say they are protecting Medicaid, Medicare and others, you're going to find out that we literally are not going to be able to run this country. My colleague came from Missouri. Everybody saw the tragedy of Joplin, Missouri. So the Cut, Cap, and Balance is going to hurt them. I'm going to call this the "Tap Dance bill" because they're going to be tap dancing around all the people who are going to be hurt.

Next who is going to be hurt are our military families. Now, they say that they're taking care of veterans' benefits, but this is active duty military. They need to be paid. They say they have classified or taken out the security. Well, have they taken out the grandmamas of these soldiers and their wives? Have they taken out the parents of these soldiers and their wives who need Medicare and Social Security? Have they taken out the sisters and brothers who need student loans? No.

So they're tap dancing around the fact that they say they're not hurting these people. It's not the Cap bill. It's the "Tap Dance bill." That's what it's going to be. Then, rather than the Cut and Cap bill, they're going to organize the "Losers' Club of America." We're going to open up a losers' club with what is going to go on on the floor to-

morrow. The "Losers' Club" will be the American people—children, seniors, college students, the jobs that we want to make through the infrastructure. How many people have driven on freeways and bridges and hit potholes? It's because America's infrastructure needs to be rebuilt.

So very quickly let me just say that, as these poster boards take their own life, the "Losers' Club" tomorrow is going to pronounce that we will be giving gifts to millionaires. They'll get \$200,000 because the bill tomorrow is worse than the Republican budget. So the millionaires will get \$200,000. Remember what I said. They call it the Cut, Cap, and Balance. I'm calling it the "Tap Dance, Losers' Club and Bust bill." So we're going to give millionaires \$200,000 a year while seniors will be paying an extra \$6,000 a year for their Medicare because it will bust Medicare as we know it.

Now, how did we get to where we are today? Why are we in this false status where people are saying, "Don't raise the debt limit"?

We brought it on ourselves. The Republicans were in charge when the Bush tax cuts came in, and they never wanted to have it expire. That was a big fight when we came in and when the President came in. That was a big fight. Out of compromise, he said, Let's be fair. So you can see the Bush tax cuts are 37 percent of our debt—37 percent. So, to talk about why we're here, look at what the Republicans have done. Then you have the Iraq war—11 percent. So it's interesting that now they're going to be fiscally responsible, yet they're the cause of the debt.

Let me finish by just saying that I am glad to be here with the Congressional Black Caucus. I want to rename the bill as the "Tap Dance, Losers' Club and Bust the American People bill"—bust the safety net for America. I want to thank the gentlelady by simply saying that I love this country, and I believe we can come together.

I have great respect for my colleagues who have a different view, but what I beg of them to do is to take the Constitution and cherish it like we all do. As to that opening part that says, "we the people," we are now calling on Republicans and Democrats and members of the Tea Party who are in this Congress to be part of the "we the people." Let us not in a frivolous manner take up the floor time that it is going to take to work on a bill that will never be signed and take it away from the resolution of the debt ceiling, which then causes the markets to go in a tailspin. I want to save the American people, and I, frankly, believe that we have the right to do so.

I will simply close by saying to you: Martin King, whose monument will open in just a few weeks, gave us a wonderful challenge—the time that he asked this Nation to believe in his dream.

□ 2110

And he gave us the further challenge of the night before his death. He indicated that he had been to the mountaintop, and he looked out and saw the Promised Land, an opportunity for all of us, no matter who we were, to have an equal opportunity in this country and to respect views but always look for the greater good.

But he said that he as a person, he didn't think that he would get to the Promised Land, but he knew that we as a people, we as Americans, would get to the Promised Land some day. I still believe in that dream and in that charge. And I am asking for my colleagues to work with us to be able to do that—this time on behalf of the American people.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you so much for your charts. You're really pointing out who would be hurt by the Cut, Cap, and Balance, or as you call it, the tap dancing bill. Sometimes you have to call it what it is. So thank you, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for joining us this evening.

I listened to New York Times columnist Tom Friedman yesterday, and I think we ought to put his talk on with the one that he had with our Nation's governors on DVD and make it required listening for some of our stonewalling colleagues. He put an adjective on the debate or so-called negotiations that have been staged these last few weeks. He called the debate "idiotic." Now, some may agree, some may disagree with that.

But he further said, and this I do agree with, that it is not worthy of our country and a disservice to our children.

So just like the other 74 times since 1962, 74 times that a clean, non-controversial lift of our debt ceiling has been done, we should have done it a long time ago, and that's what we ought to do now. And then after that, whether we use Bowles-Simpson or Rivlin-Domenici or what's left of the Gang of Six—I guess it is now just Democrats—their plan is a starting point; we need to begin coming up with a solid deficit reduction plan that isn't done on the backs of our poor, our middle class, our children, our seniors, and our people with disabilities. And one that is as the President has called for, one of shared sacrifices. It's the only fair way. It's the only American way.

And while important to securing the future, deficit reduction by itself is not enough. We are still in a recession, a recovery, but it's very slow, and it's uneven. What we need now are jobs, jobs, and more jobs. We need to continue the work of the Recovery Act and add to the 3 million jobs that we either saved or created with that bill and that act. We need to rebuild our manufacturing base as the Make It in America Democratic agenda would do. And we have to revive the housing market to help families stay in their homes and restore the opportunity for every American and those who came to live

in this country to achieve what we call the American dream.

We need to do what we have always done best—to create. We need to regain our place as the innovation capital of the world. And to do that and to secure a sustainable future for our children, we have to invest in the work of bringing our country back from 25th in science, 17th in math, 14th in reading, and 12th in college graduates.

The issue should not be cut, cut, cut. I agree with Tom Friedman on that as well. But it should be how do we do what is necessary to bring our beloved Nation back to the first-place standing which is where it always must be and what our families and our children deserve.

As the African proverb said—this is really what's happening now—the elephants are fighting and the grass is getting crushed.

This should not be a fight over political ideology. Democratic leaders have shown their willingness to compromise on many of the programs we hold sacred. What those compromises are and how large they are I think will determine where the CBC stands when the time comes to vote.

But there can be no compromise, as you've heard from my colleagues tonight, on Social Security, which has nothing to do with the deficit whatsoever, or on Medicare, which we have done so much to strengthen and lengthen in the Affordable Care Act, or on Medicaid, which would not only cause undue but grave harm to the poor and all of the States and territories that we represent.

So I say to my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Capitol, let's raise this debt ceiling. Let's forget this crazy debate about cutting programs that hurt our fellow Americans and do it in a clean vote so that we can get back to the important critical business of creating jobs, of rebuilding our country, of putting in place a strong foundation for our future, of restoring our image in the world and holding on to our position of leadership.

I yield the balance of my time to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

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

I want to thank her so very much for her leadership but I wanted to—when I said the bust, I want to equate it to the balanced budget amendment. That is what this Cap, Cut, and Balance is; it is a balanced budget amendment.

But let me be very clear, because you said something very important. The balanced budget amendment, if it was passed, would virtually guarantee that future budgets would cut and end Medicare as well as drastically cut Medicaid, just like the Republican budget. The balanced budget amendment takes two-thirds of the House and the Senate to pass. It is almost impossible for it to pass.

And we are not like States where States do balance but they only have to take care of their State.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. What you are saying, though, is we would never be able to raise any revenue because it takes two-thirds of both bodies to be able to do anything to increase revenue.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. So in Joplin, Missouri, the floods, the tornadoes—and let me finish on this.

We served on Homeland Security. We have seen the death of Mr. Karzai's brother, his very close aide. We have seen Pakistani police officers shot down in a massacre by the Taliban. This is a very serious climate of terrorism in this world.

And the tragedy, the backdrop of 9/11 where we had to bail out the airlines, where we had to rebuild New York and other places, that is a responsibility of America. That's why there is a Federal Government. And if we are to play with this through the Cap, Cut, and Balance, the balanced budget amendment, we will be the tap dance, we will be the losers club, and we will bust the rights of Americans to call upon their Federal Government when they are in need.

This is not a time to play with the lives of Americans. I believe that we are ready to compromise but not to engage in frivolity when it is serious and when we have to do what the American people need us to do.

I am very glad to be with the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands tonight, but I couldn't leave the podium without emphasizing that homeland security cannot be undermined and diminished. It is extremely important and does well to serve and secure the American people. Let's do right by the American people.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank the gentlelady from Texas.

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

#### CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION FOR A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m., 22 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

America is the greatest Nation in the history of the world. We enjoy a standard of living that is envied by most. We have a national defense unmatched in history. We are a beacon of freedom for all.

Have you ever thought about why America is the world's leader? Are we just lucky. No. I would submit to you that there are substantive reasons for our greatness.

We are blessed today because of the sacrifices of others before us, others who gave of themselves to ensure a better future for their children and succeeding generations. History shows us that great nations rise and great nations fall, but they rarely fall from

without without first suffering weakness from within.

Today, the greatest threat to America is not a foreign power. No. America's greatest threat is Washington's irresponsible, dangerous, and insatiable spending habits. Admiral Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified recently before the House Armed Services Committee that America's greatest national security threat is our own unsustainable and growing debt burden. It wasn't al Qaeda. It wasn't North Korea. It wasn't the Taliban. It wasn't any other foe across the globe. It was our unsustainable national debt. And he is right.

□ 2120

For years, Washington has been on a spending binge of epic proportions. Why do Washington's politicians risk America's future? Because they have put their own self-interests above America's interests. They spend money we don't have to get votes for the next election. They don't care about who must pay the bill. They don't care about America's future generations. They don't care whether their spending binges risk America's future.

Some say we don't need a balanced budget constitutional amendment to force Washington to spend within our means. They are 100 percent dead wrong. Most recently, the President stated: We don't need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs. The Constitution already tells us to do our jobs—and to make sure that the government is living within its means and making responsible choices.

And he went on: We don't need more studies. We don't need a balanced budget amendment. We simply need to make these tough choices and be willing to take on our bases.

But history has established that we need, in the United States Congress, a balanced budget constitutional amendment because it will provide the backbone that Congress has lacked for so long. History proves those naysayers are wrong. Three years of trillion-dollar-plus deficits proved them wrong. Projected trillion-dollar deficits into the future proved them wrong.

America must rise up and force Washington to live within our means before it is too late. America must give Washington the backbone it lacks. That backbone is a balanced budget constitutional amendment forcing Washington to do the right thing.

If this Congress will not pass an effective balanced budget constitutional amendment, then the States must do it for us. The Lone Star State of Texas recently passed a resolution calling for a constitutional convention for a balanced budget constitutional amendment if Congress fails to act. The great State of Alabama has joined Texas.

I will next read into the RECORD of the United States House of Representatives Alabama's Senate Joint Resolution 100 from Alabama's 2011 regular session just passed by the Alabama

State Legislature. This is Act No. 2011-400. The principal sponsor is Senator Arthur Orr. Cosponsors from the State of Alabama are Senator Scofield, Senator Sanford, Senator Holtzclaw, Senator Williams, Senator McGill, and Senator Beason.

“Enrolled, SJR100, urging Congress to propose a Federal balanced budget amendment.

“Whereas, the reluctance of the Federal Government to incur debt and other obligations was established early in American history, with deficits occurring only in relation to extraordinary circumstances such as war; yet for much of the 20th century and into the 21st, the United States has operated on a budget deficit, including the 2010 budget year, which surpassed an astounding \$1.3 trillion, an annual deficit that exceeded the entire gross State product of many of the States; and

“Whereas, an exception to this pattern was at the turn of the 21st century; in FY 2001, America enjoyed \$128 billion budget surplus; and

“Whereas, since FY 2001, America has been burdened with 10 consecutive years of deficits, to wit:

“FY 2002, \$158 billion deficit; FY 2003, \$377 billion deficit; FY 2004, \$413 billion deficit; FY 2005 \$318 billion deficit; FY 2006 \$248 billion deficit; FY 2007, \$161 billion deficit; FY 2008, \$459 billion deficit; FY 2009 \$1.4 trillion deficit; FY 2010, \$1.3 trillion deficit; FY 2011, \$1.5 trillion deficit (estimated); and

“Whereas, as of January 2011, America’s accumulated national debt exceeded \$12 trillion now estimated at over \$13 trillion; and

“Whereas, the Congressional Budget Office projects that, if current trends continue under the White House’s proposed budget, each of the next 10 years has a projected deficit exceeding \$600 billion; and

“Whereas, the budget deficits of the United States of America are unsustainable and constitute a substantial threat to the solvency of the Federal Government as evidenced by the comments of Standard and Poor’s on April 18, 2011, regarding the longer term credit outlook for the United States; and

“Whereas, Congress has been unwilling or unable to address the persistent problem of overspending and has recently increased the statutory limit on the public debt and enacted a variety of legislation that will ultimately cause the Federal Government to incur additional debt; and

“Whereas, the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform in its report ‘The Moment of Truth’ includes recommendations to reduce the Federal deficit that have not been considered by the United States Congress; and

“Whereas, the consequences of current spending policies are far-reaching; United States indebtedness to governments of foreign nations continues to rise; costly Federal programs that are

essentially unfunded or underfunded; mandates to States threaten the ability of State and local governments to continue to balance their budgets; moreover, future generations of Americans inevitably face increased taxation and a weakened economy as a direct result of the bloated debt; and

“Whereas, many States have previously requested that Congress propose a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, but Congress has proven to be unresponsive; anticipating a situation in which Congress at times could fail to act, the drafters of the United States Constitution had the foresight to adopt the language in Article V that establishes that on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments; and

“Whereas, in prior years, the Alabama Legislature has called on Congress to pass a balanced budget constitutional amendment, many other States have done the same, all to no avail; and

“Whereas, a balanced budget amendment would require the government not to spend more than it receives in revenues and compel lawmakers to carefully consider choices about spending and taxes; by encouraging spending control and discouraging deficit spending, a balanced budget amendment will help put the Nation on the path to lasting prosperity; now therefore,

“Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both houses thereof concurring, That the legislature of the State of Alabama hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to propose and submit to the States for ratification a Federal balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

“Be it further resolved, That, in the event that Congress does not submit a balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification on or before December 31, 2011, the Alabama Legislature hereby makes application to the United States Congress to call a convention under Article V of the United States Constitution for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to that Constitution requiring that, in the absence of a national emergency (as determined by the positive vote of such Members of each house of Congress as the amendment shall require), the total of all Federal appropriations made by Congress for any fiscal year not exceed the total of all Federal revenue for that fiscal year.

“Be it further resolved, That, unless rescinded by succeeding legislature, this application by the Alabama Legislature constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the United States Constitution until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States have made application for a convention to provide for a balanced budget.

“Be it further resolved, That, in the event that Congress does not submit a

balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification on or before December 31, 2011, the Alabama Legislature hereby requests that the legislatures of each of the several States that compose the United States apply to Congress requesting Congress to call a convention to propose such an amendment to the United States Constitution.

“Be it further resolved, That this application is rescinded in the event that a convention to propose amendments to the United States Constitution includes purposes other than providing for a balanced Federal budget.

“Be it further resolved, That the copies of this resolution be provided to the following officials:

“1. The President of the United States.

“2. The Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

“3. The President of the United States Senate.

“4. All members of the Alabama delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be officially entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an application to the Congress of the United States of America for a convention to propose an amendment to provide for a Federal balanced budget in the event that Congress does not submit such an amendment to the States for ratification on or before December 31, 2011.

“Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be provided to the Secretaries of State and to the presiding officers of the legislatures of the other States.”

Signed by Kay Ivey, President and Presiding Officer of the Alabama State Senate; signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama, Mike Hubbard; signed by the Governor of the State of Alabama, the Honorable Robert Bentley on June 7, 2011.

Congress clearly has the duty to pass a balanced budget constitutional amendment to prevent unsustainable spending sprees that threaten America’s future.

□ 2130

Quite frankly, and in my judgment, a balanced budget constitutional amendment is the only way to prevent a Federal Government insolvency and bankruptcy and the ensuing economic and national security consequences of such a bankruptcy. I urge this Congress to do the right thing and pass an effective balanced budget constitutional amendment.

But if Congress shirks its duty to America, then I plead for the States to join Texas and Alabama by demanding a constitutional convention for the limited purpose of drafting a balanced budget constitutional amendment. I urge the States to act with haste. America rapidly approaches an economic abyss. The States are our last best hope for American greatness and surviving in generations to come.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUMENAUER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of the wedding of his daughter.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

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

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 19, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2516. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Air Force Case Number F08-07, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2517. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the provision of compensation under section 439 of title 37, U.S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2518. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final Equipment Delivery Report for fiscal years 2009 and 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2519. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the biennial report on strategic and critical materials requirements for the National Defense Stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-5; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2520. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on National HIV Testing Goals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2521. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO Report GAO-10-368; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2522. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding the annual report on the Treaty with Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2523. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties

entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2524. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-10-2257); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2525. A letter from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2526. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Strategic Plan for FY 2011-FY 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2527. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting the 2010 management reports and statements on the system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2528. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "2011 Report to Congress on the Benefits and Costs of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local and Tribal Entities"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2529. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2530. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2010 Annual Report of an independent auditor who has audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2531. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an extension of the Department's Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the Republic of Columbia Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material from the Pre-Hispanic Cultures and Certain Ecclesiastical Material from the Republic of Columbia, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2532. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the Economic Development Administration for Fiscal Year 2010, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3213; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

#### 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. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2061. A bill to au-

thorize the presentation of a United States flag at the funeral of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as a Federal employee; with amendments (Rept. 112-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 355. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2560) to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget (Rept. 112-150). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 2573. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the period of applicability of the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for hospitals; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to create a pilot program to award grants to units of general local government and community-based organizations to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2575. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to withhold a portion of Federal-aid Highway funds apportioned to a State unless the State enacts and implements a law establishing penalties for using a cell phone to make telephone calls or text while driving with a minor in the vehicle; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the calculation of modified adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 2577. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 2578. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 2579. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to take into account all available hydrologic data in conducting Missouri River basin operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 2580. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress posthumously to Father Mychal Judge, O.F.M., beloved Chaplain of the Fire Department of New York who passed away as the first recorded victim of the September 11, 2001, attacks in recognition of his example to the Nation of selfless dedication to duty and compassion for one's fellow citizens; to the Committee on Financial Services.



By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2581. A bill to provide that the public debt limit shall not affect timely payment in full of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H. Res. 356. A resolution urging the European Union and its member states to maintain the arms embargo against the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 2573.

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

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have the power to promote the General Welfare

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2574.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2575.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2576.

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

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

Furthermore, this bill makes specific changes to existing law, in accordance with the Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution; whereby the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 2577.

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

Clauses 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution the United States Congress

shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes".

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2578.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2579.

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

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

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2580.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have the Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2581.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 100: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 157: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 219: Mr. FORBES and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 303: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 440: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 466: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 530: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 589: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 593: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 642: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 645: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 687: Mr. OWENS and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 721: Mrs. ROBY and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 750: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 791: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 886: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 891: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 972: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1041: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 1042: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1063: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1161: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1242: Mrs. CAPPES.

H.R. 1269: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 1322: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1370: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1386: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1397: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 1462: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1465: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1489: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1506: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1588: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1591: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1639: Mr. COOPER and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1685: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1686: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1703: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1723: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1834: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1842: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1852: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1895: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1953: Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1970: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2016: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2026: Mrs. CAPPES.

H.R. 2030: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2036: Mr. BUCSHON and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2091: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2161: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2164: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2185: Mr. POLIS, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2224: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2236: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2250: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2280: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2357: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2402: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2407: Mr. NADLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2492: Mr. FARR and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2529: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2544: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2554: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2560: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BERG, Mr. THORBERRY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. FILNER.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. LEE and Ms. BASS of California.

H. Res. 130: Mr. POLIS.

H.Res. 220: Mr. TOWNS.

H.Res. 333: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.Res. 342: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.Res. 353: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

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

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited



July 18, 2011

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5151

tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 2560, to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget, do not

contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R.

2560, to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.