

body, to pass this legislation immediately. We ought to be strengthening and significantly expanding it, not doing less than status quo, which is what we're doing today because of some budget concerns that people have. This is the quintessential watchdog agency in this town. It doesn't get the big press, as Mr. WOLF said. It doesn't have the big bucks—no K Street lobbyists—but it is a wonderful and a very important and effective Commission that keeps track of religious persecution globally, that keeps us in line in the House and the Senate and also the State Department. I read their reports. I read them from cover to cover. Please, I would ask the Members of this body to support this legislation and call on our friends in the Senate to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2867, "United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011." This legislation mandates the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (Commission) compliance with federal anti-discrimination laws, restricts the Commissioner to two consecutive terms, and requires the Commissioner to attend 75 percent of Commission meetings. H.R. 2867, extends the Commission's sunset date by two years, and appropriates \$4.29 million for FY12 and FY13. In addition, H.R. 2867 requires study to determine the Commission's effectiveness to ensure that the act is being implemented properly.

As a senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I understand the importance of protecting the religious rights of men, women, and children throughout the world. By advocating for religious stability, we in turn decrease the likelihood of religious extremism and advance the growth of healthy nations. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom serves as an essential fact finder and impartial advisor on these matters.

The 18th District of Texas is home to many different faiths and religious backgrounds and welcomes a variety of views on religion. This reflects the principles of freedom of religion upon which our nation was founded. The founding fathers understood the importance of freedom of religion and the perils of religious persecution. Respect for the religious practices of others is woven into the very fabric of the United States.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom is an independent, bipartisan commission. The Commissioners are appointed by the President and Congress. The Commission's core mission is to review international violations of religion freedom and make policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State and Congress. These recommendations impact the lives of millions of people of faith around the world. I believe in the importance of protecting those who are being persecuted based upon their religious beliefs.

According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, 198 countries, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom. The study found that 101 governments used force

against religious groups or individuals. Christians and Muslims, who make up more than half of the world's population, were harassed in more countries than other religions, although the study does not reflect the intensity of the persecution. This study was conducted prior to the Arab Spring. Many of the nations with increasing religious restrictions are the very nations that have seen popular uprisings and subsequent crackdowns—among them Egypt, Yemen, Syria and Libya, a clear indication that we need this Commission more than ever.

I firmly believe that the Commission has a positive impact on the lives of millions of people of faith throughout the world, especially at a time when many governments continue to repress religious freedom and persecute persons on the basis of their religion. Such repression only stands to marginalize vulnerable populations, emboldens extremists, fuels sectarian tensions, and robs societies of the moral and charitable contributions of faith communities.

Repression of religious freedom runs contrary to shared universal values and undermines genuine stability. In the words of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton "Religious freedom provides a cornerstone for every healthy society. It empowers faith-based service. It fosters tolerance and respect among different communities. And it allows nations that uphold it to become more stable, secure, and prosperous."

The Commission monitors religious freedom through the lens of international human rights standards, such as those found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Forty-five years ago the nations of the world signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which codified in international law the right to religious freedom. The ICCPR affirmed under Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that "everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching."

The Commission is not a tool to advance religious beliefs or any specific values. It is focused on addressing the religious climate in each country based upon the ICCPR. By relying on international human rights standards as specified in ICCPR, The Commission guards against any attempts to impose American values on other nations, but rather examines the actions of foreign governments against these universal standards and by their freely undertaken international commitments. This Commission is a vital resource in learning to address conflicts between religious groups, especially in the wake of the Arab Spring.

As the Commission serves to address the violations of religious freedom abroad, Congress is charged with ensuring the Commission itself is in compliance with laws that protect the rights of workers and those they serve. H.R. 2867 reflects the principle that discrimination has no place within our government and will ensure that the commission itself complies with all federal anti-discrimination laws. This is an essential distinction from the current law, which lacks these robust discrimination protections. This legislation further

underscores the importance of this Commission by expending the sunset date of the Commission by 2 years to September 30, 2013. Lastly, the amount of appropriations allotted for the Commission would be amended by striking \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year 2003, to \$4,291,000 for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

I firmly believe that H.R. 2867 will allow the Commission to continue to address international religious persecution, provide much needed discrimination protections, and will garner the appropriate amount of oversight to ensure that the Commission operates as effectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2867, 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.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 392 and as the designee of the majority leader, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Reed moves that the House proceed to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on August 2, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(3) of title 31, United States Code, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(4) of title 31, United States Code, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage

without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1300

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to offer this resolution of disapproval of the request from the President of the United States to borrow an additional one-half trillion dollars. Dealing with this national debt is one of the primary reasons why I ran for Congress. It is to stop the endless borrowing of Washington, D.C. on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. I am also pleased to offer it in the House as the demonstration of a commitment to ending the decades-old borrow-and-spend practices and mentality that runs rampant here in Washington.

Our national debt has reached its breaking point. The need to make serious decisions to get our spending under control has never been more urgent. We have all heard the words of Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When asked what is the most direct threat to our Nation, his immediate and clear response was that our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. The recent downgrade of our national credit rating by S&P further demonstrates the necessity of making significant structural changes to the way we spend money in Washington, D.C.

My focus here today, because we know the Senate has acted and this resolution did not pass the Senate—and is likely not to result in the borrowing of the President getting the additional half a trillion dollars of borrowing—but it's to send a message to the Nation that we need to act proactively in this Chamber and in both Chambers of this House. We need to recognize the national debt. And rather than deal with it in a crisis situation, we should be mindful of it in a proactive, strategic, open and honest manner so that we have good, sound policy responses to the issue that we face and finally tame this beast known as the national debt.

We have spent over \$15 trillion of money we did not have. That national debt is growing at the rate of \$58,000 per second. That's \$55,000 owed by every man, child and woman in America. That level of borrowing, that level of spending is just not acceptable because it jeopardizes our Nation and,

more importantly, jeopardizes our Nation for the generations yet to come.

The American people have made it clear. They spoke loudly in November 2010, and we are listening. More borrowing won't solve the problem. In fact, it will dig the hole even deeper. Borrowing even more before we can enact significant spending cuts to begin dealing with the root problem is a foolish errand. We have a responsibility to future generations to take immediate action.

I will continue along the path of working on both sides of this Chamber to try to identify common ground to solve this crisis on the national debt. The continuing resolution last spring and the Budget Control Act, which requires this vote, are only the beginning.

This war on our national debt is going to go on for many years to come; but we need to take those first steps because with every journey it takes the first step to get us on the path too success. I know the battles ahead will not be popular, and there will be tremendous political pressure on all of us to continue to borrow and spend as usual, but we must stand up to that political pressure. We must honor our oath to do our duty and do our job in this Chamber, and that means standing up and changing the path of Washington, D.C. Making difficult decisions now is the only way we can win this war on what is a common enemy we all face, our national debt.

It is my hope this resolution continues to show the President how serious we are about this issue and at the same time that we are dealing with this issue we will focus on jobs, we will focus on the economy. We, in the United States Congress, have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We are competent men and women in this Chamber who love our great Nation.

We must come together on all fronts at all times, not only on the national debt but on our economy, on getting Americans back to work. And I think, with that bipartisan attitude, it will be amazing what we can accomplish in order to achieve all those goals, the national debt being one of the critical ones that we must face head on today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we should not even be considering this resolution. I repeat, we should not even be considering this resolution. We should be moving forward, not backwards. This resolution is a dangerous distraction from the unprecedented challenge before us.

Fourteen million Americans are looking for work. The Census Bureau reported just yesterday that the poverty rate is higher than it's been in 17 years, and median income in this country is at 1996 levels.

The President has proposed a jobs bill that one knowledgeable observer,

Mark Zandi, estimates would create 1.9 million new jobs and add 2 percentage points to GDP growth next year. We need action to spur economic growth and job creation. That's what we should be considering today.

Instead, through this resolution, Republicans want to prolong the agony of the debt limit debate and take us back to the brink of default, which would be where we would be if you succeeded.

This bill can pass the House only if Members who voted "yes" in August on this issue decide in essence to vote "no" in September. "Yes" in August, "no" in September.

This Nation wants us to be guided by the needs of the Nation, not the internal politics of a caucus or a conference. We have seen the consequences of that kind of Republican brinkmanship. Standard & Poor's said, in downgrading our credit rating: "It involved a level of brinkmanship greater than what we had expected earlier in the year."

In August, consumer confidence dropped by the largest amount since the peak of the financial crisis in 2008, and the conference board noted a direct link between the fall and the debate over default. I think we need only to check 401(k) statements from August to remember the precipitous drop in the stock market.

Were this resolution to become law, all those who speak or vote for it have to understand that the U.S. would default on its obligations for the first time in our history. This would throw our economy back into deep recession, trigger \$400 billion in immediate job-destroying cuts, and call into question our ability to pay earned Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Madam Speaker, we should not be considering this resolution today. We should be moving forward on the President's plan to jump-start our economy and create jobs for American workers.

□ 1310

The American Jobs Act will put more money in workers' pockets through a temporary tax cut, saving the average family \$1,500. It would also keep over 6 million workers from losing their unemployment benefits while they continue searching for work and provide new employer incentives to help get them hired.

If we don't act on these issues, over a million people will lose their unemployment benefits in January and over 2 million in February. So we need to act. We need to look ahead, not just try to go backwards.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution so we don't waste one more minute on a renewal of Republican brinkmanship. Fourteen million Americans who are looking for a job and 43 million Americans who are living in poverty cannot afford to wait 1 minute longer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution of disapproval because Washington will continue to have a deficit spending problem until we say enough is enough and we put a stop to it. The gentleman across the aisle would like to say this is going backwards. Every time I hear someone on the left speak, it ends up costing us more money. We need to stop the insanity here in Washington. We need to stop this overspending. It seems like the only proposals that are coming our way are more spending and more taxes, so I strongly support this resolution.

I opposed the debt deal because we can no longer wait to make deep spending cuts and balance our Federal budget. We need to act now. Today we have an opportunity to prevent some of the debt deal from going into effect and disallow the government from borrowing another \$500 billion—borrowing another half trillion dollars.

Recently, we heard the President keep saying on his new proposal: Pass this bill now. Pass this bill now. Pass this bill today. I'm saying and the American people are saying: Stop the spending now. Stop the spending today. Stop putting this burden on our children and grandchildren. Yet the President wants to continue to go out there and sell a jobs plan that is more of the same, and he wants to pay for it mysteriously, shockingly, by raising taxes that will do nothing but kill jobs. So his own proposal that he wants the Congress to take up, in effect, will destroy jobs.

Somehow we have to convince the people here in Washington and the President that it's not the government that creates jobs. It's the individual. It's the entrepreneurs, the people willing to take risks. But they are not willing to take risks in an economy where the President continues to try to push more regulation and more laws and more taxes. It just doesn't make sense, and the American people are fed up. They've had it. Enough is enough. We've spent way too much money.

During the August district work period, over 500 people showed up to my town hall meeting in Fort Myers, Florida. And do you know what I heard over and over again? "Hold the line on government spending." "Stay strong." "Reduce government."

And this one I love: "It's not your money; it's my money." See, only in Washington do the people in this room look at it as their money. They look at your money as their money. It's not. It's the people's who have earned it.

Now a comment was made by a constituent of mine, Edward Benet, which I think speaks directly to this issue. He said: "We have to reduce the size and scope of government. I'm unemployed, but just because I don't have a job doesn't mean my neighbor should have to pay for me." And then he continued on: "The best way for government to help is to step aside, get out of the way, and let individuals and businesses do what they do best."

He and his family are willing to sacrifice to preserve the economic freedom for Americans. We must cut spending now. That's why I introduced the 1 Percent Spending Reduction Act, commonly known as the Mack Penny Plan. With this plan, we can balance the budget in 8 years by capping spending at 18 percent of GDP in the 7th year and cutting 1 penny out of every Federal dollar for 6 years. One penny. Everybody at home, every business, every individual has had to take more than 1 penny out of their home budget or 1 penny out of their business budget over the last 4 to 6 years. And for the Federal Government to instead be talking about spending more money every year, we need to cut spending. We need to balance our budget. My plan will balance the budget in 8 years.

And for those people who might want to say we're not for just across-the-board cuts, great. What we've said is Congress decides where the 1 percent comes from. But if the Congress fails, then we're going to require an across-the-board cut. So we can either work together, or one way or another we'll get the 1 percent across the board.

The deficit spending has to stop. Like I said before, enough is enough. I support this resolution, and I would encourage all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the gentleman, working together won't work if you undo the work that we did together.

I now yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I'm a great fan of the tradition of comedy in America, and I want to salute my Republican colleagues for this tribute to one of our great comedians who died tragically early, Gilda Radner, who in the early days of "Saturday Night Live" invented the character of Roseanne Roseannadanna, who would get on the news segment and say something outlandish. And then when she was corrected, her response was, "Never mind."

This is the "never mind" resolution that the Republicans have brought forward. People should understand what this says. It says that the bill that we passed that kept the government from shutting down—and I didn't like the bill, but I liked the part of it that kept the government from shutting down. I was ready to vote just for an increase in the debt limit. Singling out the increase in the debt limit and canceling it, that's what this does. What this says is—and here's the problem. We have a majority that has a problem with reality. They have a problem with reality in the field of science. They have a problem with reality in the field of the economy.

One of the manifestations of that is their objection to raising the debt

limit that was in large part necessary because of debt they incurred. You know, when the debt limit came up, it struck me: It wasn't my debt limit; I didn't vote for the war in Iraq at a cost of a trillion dollars; I didn't vote to give millionaires a tax cut that they didn't need and that had no beneficial effect on the economy. But I did, out of a sense of responsibility, vote to raise the debt limit. Now, I voted against one of them, but I voted for several others.

What this bill says is this: Yes, we had to, because we were getting a lot of pressure, vote to raise the debt limit, but now that that is safely behind us, we're going to pretend that we were really against it. So this is the "never mind" resolution. People should understand this. What this resolution would do would be to undo what just happened.

So we have Members on the majority side who have trouble explaining to their primary voters why they had a temporary embrace of reality. Now they're not comfortable with that. Their primary voters aren't comfortable with that. So having done what they had to do, they now want to pretend that they're going to undo it.

The Senate has already killed this. They don't want it to pass because, understand what it would do, it would put us right back in the debt limit situation crisis.

And, by the way, these are people who are putting this resolution forward who purport to believe that a major concern with the economy today is the uncertainty that faces investors. So what do they do? They bring up a resolution today that would re-create—if anyone took it seriously, and I will give them the credit of saying that they don't. But if anyone took it seriously, it would re-create the greatest source of uncertainty we've seen in a long time, whether or not the Federal Government was going to shut down. So that's the phoniness of this.

□ 1320

Now let's talk about the substance. My colleagues claim to be against spending. Apparently, in their world, the nearly \$700 billion that is spent annually by the Pentagon isn't spending. I don't know what it is. We have a situation in which this year in the budget the Republicans brought forward a bill to increase military spending by \$17 billion while funds for local police and funds for local street repair were cut. So that's the problem.

Yes, I am for reducing spending. I am for reducing a swollen Pentagon budget. We had the President reduce by 10,000 the troops in Afghanistan. Many on the Republican side, including their leadership, criticized him for that. Do they think 10,000 troops in Afghanistan are paid for with "funny" money?

The fact is that while on the one hand we hear these complaints about spending, we have people who are pushing for more and more spending. And I

have to say here that I would include my administration in this. And I think if the President expects us to go along with certain restraints elsewhere, adding billions of dollars to what we have already wasted in Iraq by keeping thousands of troops in Iraq beyond this—and, by the way, why are we keeping troops in Iraq? One of the leading advocates for keeping troops in Iraq, a leading Republican Senator, Senator GRAHAM, said we must keep our troops in Iraq because we have to police the border between the Arabs and the Kurds, that at a time when we are denying funds to our cities to police their own areas.

So, let's be clear. First of all, this sham says, You know what? We had to vote to raise the debt limit. We're now going to engage in this mock exercise of taking back what we did. If anybody takes it seriously, it will send waves of uncertainty back into the economy. But, secondly, going forward, yes, join us. And that includes some on the Republican side—unfortunately, a small minority. Don't give more and more and more for the military not to defend America, not to fight terrorism. Those things are not in controversy, but to subsidize the wealthy European nations.

Madam Speaker, the NATO nations outside the United States spend an average of 1.7 percent of their gross domestic product on the military. We spend 5.4 percent—more than three times as much. And my Republican colleagues have resisted reducing that. What they want to do is subsidize the social safety nets and the spending of Western Europe at the expense of spending here. And how do we do that? By allowing them to hold down the military.

So people who want to keep troops in Iraq; people who objected when the President began a withdrawal that was too timid, in my judgment, from Afghanistan; people who want to continue to spend unnecessarily and unwisely not to defend America but to keep America the worldwide policemen have no credibility in complaining about spending.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. I thank the gentleman.

For too long, the Federal Government has been allowed to engage in an irresponsible spending spree that has resulted in the accumulation of over \$14 trillion of debt, and \$3 trillion of that debt occurred in just the last 3 years under President Obama.

Does anyone really believe that the American people have received a good return on their investment? I know that many of my constituents in Tennessee's Fourth District don't. Unemployment is still above 9 percent, and our economy is still not creating jobs. And now this President claims to need a \$2.4 trillion blank check to continue

with his failed policies. That means our national debt would be close to \$17 trillion by the end of next year. Enough is enough.

The latest assessment of our debt indicates it will reach 109 percent of GDP in the next decade. That will only further degrade employers' confidence in our economy and hinder their ability to create jobs. We cannot allow that to happen. I was elected by the people of Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District to come to Washington to finally make the Federal Government learn to live within its means. No more borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar, no more trillion-dollar deficits, no more stimulus spending, and, most importantly, no more expecting our children and grandchildren to pay for all of this.

The debt limit debate provided us with a real opportunity to put our Nation back on a fiscally sustainable path by finally forcing the Federal Government to make difficult, but badly needed, spending decisions—decisions that I am more than willing to make. I believe that we missed an opportunity to open up the books and do something that should have been done years ago—prioritize our spending.

It is hard to believe that with all the waste, fraud, and abuse that occurs within the Federal Government that we would have any problem cutting enough spending so that raising the debt limit would be unnecessary. When families in my district have spent more than their budget allows, they look to how they can cut back, not how they can borrow more money. Maybe they don't take a vacation that summer. Maybe they go out to eat less often or hold off on purchasing a new car. The point is they know that the answer to getting back on the right fiscal track is spending less, not borrowing more. The same should hold true for the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this joint resolution of disapproval.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because it is in favor of the United States defaulting on its debts. The Republican Party is calling for the United States to default, to tell the whole world: we don't pay our debts. That's what this is about, and it doesn't do one single thing to help American workers or businesses with jobs.

Now, make no mistake: The House of Representatives is being used by the Tea Party as an attack machine on the President. They will delay action on anything that helps the economy. The President came up here on Thursday with a plan. Where's the schedule for bringing it out on the floor to create jobs? No, we have to come up here with this resolution. For the majority, delaying economic recovery is a small price to pay if they can win an elec-

tion. They don't care about ordinary folks, working people. They only care about people on the top. Instead of doing something to help create jobs, they have brought up this bill to gin up their extreme base that thinks the only thing Americans should build together are roads and a Defense Department. That is what the U.S. Government is all about. Nothing else makes any difference. We don't need to invest in health or science. What do we need science for? It will work out. Don't worry.

In this resolution the Republicans are voting for the United States not to pay its bills. That's what we're spending time on. Today is just another day in the Alice in Wonderland of the Republican House. Pure politics and nothing to help the American people get jobs. This whole Republican Congress is about the Presidential election. It has been from the beginning back in January. Not helping the middle class. What have they done for foreclosures in this country? What have they done for youngsters trying to go to school? What have they done for anything except try and get the President? They are trying it by stopping the economy from moving forward.

I urge my colleagues not to just vote "no" on this but for the majority to withdraw it and bring up the American Jobs Act. The President brought it up here. It deserves to be brought up to the floor and debated and amended and passed.

I sometimes wonder when I listen to the discussion about this doing stuff to pay someplace down the road, some long-term investment, if a Republican has ever bought a house. I remember when I bought my first house in Seattle. I was 25 years old. I was a medical resident. I paid \$16,400 for it. And I wondered if I would ever be able to pay for it, because I wasn't making that much money in those days.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Lo and behold, I bought the house. And you know what? Thirty years later I paid off that house. That's what investment is about. What the President is saying is that we have to invest in this country if we're going to bring it out of the problems it's in. And that means infrastructure on the ground and it means in human beings in education.

□ 1330

If we don't invest, as the Greatest Generation did after the Second World War—here came Eisenhower and said, hey, we've got to build roads. Nobody said, well, you know, we can't go in debt for all that. Nobody said we can't invest in human beings.

We did the GI Bill of Rights, and that's what made us the strongest country in the world. We took every veteran who came back from the war and said here's a college education; get

it and take it out and make this country work. That was investment. But not today's Republican Party. Oh, no, we can't, we mustn't.

Don't you understand investment?

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, it's been said that leadership is willing to make hard choices, fact-based choices to come up with solutions to solve problems and deliver results.

Now, we gathered here last Thursday in this Chamber to hear the President, with a much-touted plan beforehand that he was going to bring forth to the American people that was going to help solve the high unemployment in this country and get our economy back on a competitive basis. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, I sat there and I listened very intently, and I left this Chamber with great disappointment because it's not enough.

Furthermore, he is proposing taxes, new taxes, taxes on energy production, American energy production. Now, let's look at the facts of what happened.

Yes, we had an oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and it was dealt with. It was a tragic situation, but it has been dealt with. The fact of the matter is we need American energy production to move this country forward. And now what we're seeing with the lifting of the moratorium is this continued de facto moratorium because of slow-walking of exploration plans and permits.

Now, what does this mean? If we brought back the permitting process to the same timeframe we had before—without sacrificing safety—bring it back into a reasonable amount of time, let's say 30 days to take care of these permits, in 1 year, the year 2012, 230,000 jobs would be created, new jobs, good, high-paying jobs. And not only that, a third of those jobs would be beyond the Gulf Coast States around this country, in California and Florida and in the central part of the country. This would add \$34 billion to our GDP. And that's just getting things back to where they were. That's not even talking about expanding exploration in these shale formations or looking at the east and west coast where we can do more or Alaska. These energy jobs are good-paying jobs. And not only that, it would bring in, in 1 year, \$12 billion more into the Treasury and reduce our bill on foreign oil by \$15 billion. And that's just getting us back to where we were.

Now, I stood here and listened to the President. Instead, he offers taxes, \$45 billion more in new taxes on independent oil and gas companies. That's going to hurt American energy production, it's going to kill American jobs, and it's going to do nothing to help solve our economy.

Furthermore, he chided us about the trade agreements. We have three trade

agreements sitting there. They've been there for 3 years. They've been negotiated. They're ready to go. And he said Congress needs to pass them. Well, Mr. President, the answer is: Send them to Congress and we'll pass them. That's the process.

And beyond that, what is our trade policy? This country is losing credibility globally and it's losing its leverage because we have no trade strategy, a strategy that's going to promote American-manufactured goods, American farmers and their commodities so that we can sell these around the world to open markets. That will get our economy going.

If we want to solve our debt problem, yes, we've got to balance our budgets, yes, we've got to deal with the debt problem—we've taken some steps—but I saw nothing that the President offered. That's why I'm here supporting this resolution, to push this President to consider the steps that need to be taken to promote American competitiveness, private sector job growth. That's what we need in this economy.

Now, the President had the answer. He was standing here at this podium and he had the answer right up there on the wall of the House behind him. There is a plaque up there, and it's a quote from Daniel Webster. And that first sentence of the quote says, "Let us develop the resources of our land." What's wrong with that, Mr. President?

For God's sake, we need American energy production, and it's simple. With the stroke of a pen, he could solve this permitting problem and at least get us back to where we were, create 230,000 jobs next year and add to our GDP growth. And this would be a start, a down payment to a comprehensive energy strategy for this country. This is a no-brainer.

We need natural gas as part of our transition strategy. His policy is going to lock out natural gas production in this country. Ninety-seven percent of it is done by small domestic companies here in the U.S., and these taxes will put many of these companies out of business.

Mr. President, read the plaque. Let's develop our natural resources. Let's do what we have to do. Let's promote a very aggressive, export-oriented trade policy.

And we need a willing partner to move forward with tax reform. We're getting half-hearted signals. This country needs fundamental tax reform. We want to do it on the House Ways and Means Committee. We're ready. We stand ready as willing partners, but yet we're getting signals—mixed signals. This administration has not shown a serious intent to move forward with fundamental tax reform that will unleash American ingenuity and entrepreneurship in this country.

And that's what I heard all through August when I was back home in my district when I talked to folks. They want to see an energy strategy. They want to see comprehensive tax reform

that simplifies our Code and lowers rates and clears up some of the loopholes. They want to make sense out of this Tax Code. And they want to see us selling goods overseas, letting our ports expand.

He didn't even mention maritime infrastructure. We've got bills right now that would improve our maritime infrastructure without costing one penny more in deficit spending. Why aren't we acting on these things?

We're tired of rhetoric. We're tired of political talking points. And what we need is action. The American people have had enough. And I say let's get to work. Let's get this House moving on fundamental changes that will improve this economy and create private sector jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana, I listened intently, and I don't understand how he could have voted "yes" to raise the debt ceiling in August and now, in essence, he's going to vote "no" and bring this country back to the brink of chaos.

I now yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a very active member of our committee, Mr. NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I'm fascinated by this argument, for the people that are viewing it, largely because this is not an argument about new spending; this is an argument about paying for past spending. So when Bill Clinton said adio, said goodbye to the American people on January 19, 2001—this is fact, not opinion—America was staring at a \$5.6 trillion surplus. On January 20, George Bush took the oath of office, and when he left 8 years later, we were looking at a \$10.6 trillion deficit.

Let's recount those years: Two wars, \$2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts, and a prescription D benefit that was unfunded. And all of the money they applied to those arguments—and I am very pleased by the fact I voted against those tax cuts, spoke against them, and voted against the war in Iraq. But all of the money that I've just referenced was borrowed money by the Republican Party. They borrowed all of the money for it—fact, not opinion. And now the bill has come due, and they're on the floor talking about fiscal rectitude.

Now, here's what I think is important: The gentleman from Florida opened this debate, my friend, Mr. MACK, by talking about our money and how that money is utilized. Well, guess what? The veterans hospitals, 35,000 men and women wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, is he saying that that's not our money that ought to pay for those hospitals?

□ 1340

Joe Stiglitz has estimated that the cost of disability for the war in Iraq will be between \$500 billion and \$900 billion.

I hope people pay attention to what I'm about to say. Almost one out of two people who have served us honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan, they're coming back with a long-term disability. Those VA hospitals are going to be stretched for years to come.

Now, whether you were for Iraq or against it, our responsibility is to pay for those men and women who served us honorably: 20 years old, life expectancy of 80, they're in our care for the next 60 years.

I would note with some humor that the Republican leadership did not send out, today, people that were here for the tax cut vote or for the vote on the war in Iraq. Remember weapons of mass destruction and how that vote was to take place?

Friends, this is about paying our bills. This is not about new spending. And I hope there's no confusion in the hinterlands. Today, because of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, every American citizen has a bill of \$17,000.

They helped bring us to this path of fiscal irresponsibility during their years of borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and they ask the American people to embrace amnesia. They set the fire, and now they're calling the fire department.

This is a very simple vote. It's about paying our bills.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding on such an important subject that we're talking about today.

I would like to make a couple of points in reference to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just made regarding the Republican Party. And I would say that the Republican Party did make mistakes at the beginning of this decade. I would say the Democrat Party has made some mistakes in the last several years. I think there's plenty of blame to go around for both parties in Washington.

But there's a new crew in town. There's 87 new Republicans that were elected last November from all across this country who have joined those in our party who are saying stop the spending. Stop the madness. We're working against ourselves, folks.

Madam Speaker, I would say that we wouldn't have to continue having this discussion if we would stop spending, stop borrowing, and then we would focus on the economy. It's going to take both sides to come together to fix the problem within our economy.

We're going to have to control our spending. We're going to have to help those Americans who are out there and those who are actually establishing jobs, those who are creating jobs. It's not the U.S. Government that is going to create the jobs for those who are unemployed.

I believe that we have a great opportunity right now to again say, let's stop this sort of spending binge in

Washington, D.C. We're passing on debt to our kids and our grandkids. This is an opportunity for us to come together, both parties, and say, let's forget about the sins of the past. Let's pay those bills. But let's not continue to spend the way that we're spending today.

From a debt of \$79 million when the Revolutionary War ended, the United States has racked up a debt of nearly \$14.6 trillion. It would take nearly everything that Americans produced in all of last year to pay off the existing national debt.

Right now I see two competing visions in Washington and across this country, Madam Speaker. The first vision is the "business as usual" vision. And we see a lot of that right here in Washington. It says we need to blindly increase our debt; and if people complain, call it investment instead of debt.

In May, President Obama called for a no-cuts-attached increase to the debt ceiling. He didn't give up his call for a blank check until his request had failed here in this House by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 97-318.

The second vision that I hear a lot about back in Indiana is the same vision and the same work that families do every year. You figure out how to live within your means. You have real cuts, not budgetary gimmicks. You don't fool yourself when you're sitting around the kitchen table trying to figure out the mess that you find yourself in. It's based on the truth.

Families sit down at the kitchen table and have the heart-to-heart talks about the situation that they're in. Two conclusions that they usually come to are, we have to cut spending, and we're going to have to figure out how to bring more dollars in. It accepts the challenge, Americans accept the challenge, knowing that these things are not easy.

We know that the "business as usual" vision, it's broken, and it will inevitably lead us to ruin and more ruin. This vote is a vote against that vision.

I come to the floor to support the second vision, the vision that Americans across this country support, a vision that is shared by the men and women of northeast Indiana. It is a vision of prudence, honest conversations, and optimism.

When we get pulled into these discussions because of the continual discussion about more spending, we cannot focus on the important part of getting people back to work and growing our economy. Government doesn't create jobs. Governors don't create jobs. Americans create jobs. I believe in the American people, and that hope is still a part of our vocabulary.

I believe that we're also changing the discussion here in Washington. Career politicians have had their day in Washington, and it's time to talk about cuts. And since we've talked about cuts, the sky has not fallen. Optimism

is a part of what the American fabric is built upon. I believe that this Joint Deficit Committee needs to find common ground for actual cuts and that the Senate will pick up the job growth bill that we passed right here on the floor of the House of Representatives this Congress.

We all knew that this debt ceiling debate was never going to be our final battle in a struggle for balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. It gives us the chance to continue to talk about it. And if we want to continue to raise the debt, if we want to continue to increase spending, we'll continue to talk about why we need to restrain Washington politicians.

I'm going to continue the dialogue. I believe it's crucial. It's an important part of saving this country's economic future for my kids, for our children and for our grandchildren across this country.

Government has, for too long, continued this business as usual and the status quo vision that I talked about earlier. Americans are going to have to pay back all of this debt. This may not be a tax increase, but inevitably and indirectly it is.

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

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. So, Madam Speaker, I come to the floor in support of this resolution because I believe that we need to all agree, Republicans and Democrats, that we're going to limit spending, we're going to stop borrowing.

We can pay our bills back. But at the same time we're going to focus on job creation, getting people back to work, as the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned, the energy jobs that were talked about. That was one of the things the President didn't discuss in his address the other night is he didn't talk about energy.

We are the leaders in the world on production. I come from a district of a lot of manufacturing; and I believe that if we would focus on energy, cut spending, we need to reform government. That's what's going to get people back to work. The economy's going to grow. We will still be number one in the world.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds. This resolution isn't about a new vision. It's really about blind rage. There may be a new crew in town; but if this were to pass, it would be a wrecking crew because, essentially, we would be back on the edge, once again, of default.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, America was united in its disgust at the spectacle in Washington during the debt ceiling fiasco. The Republican threat of default ranks among the most reckless and destructive political stunts in modern American history. It undermined the fragile, but recovering, economy and reduced faith in

the United States of America. It has also undermined the American people's trust in its government.

There's no reason to have a debt ceiling at all. It doesn't restrain spending since the spending has already been committed. It just threatens our credit, and it weakens our country.

That's why I, Representative NADLER, and Representative MORAN introduced this morning the Full Faith and Credit Act, a bill to do away with the debt ceiling once and for all.

□ 1350

But if we are going to have a debt ceiling, the threat by Members of Congress to refuse to raise it is an outrage. We've already made these commitments; yet some would have us default. Some would undermine the full faith and credit of the United States. Some would do irreparable damage to our economy and our standing in the world. It's a disgrace. It's a total disgrace.

And the American people see it for what it is: part of a concerted effort to undermine this economy in order to undermine the President and fulfill the congressional Republicans' Inauguration Day vow to do everything within their power to ensure that President Obama would be a one-term President.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me.

I do support this resolution.

Here in this Chamber—actually, here in America—we often talk about achievements in terms of metrics: the larger, the better. For a private company, it's impressive when it has a large budget, a large workforce, and a large profit and a large presence.

The Federal Government, as an institution, should not talk this way, even though similar assertions would all be true. Washington spends too much, employs too many people, and is too intrusive in the lives of all Americans.

The major difference is that private business makes investments that deliver returns, and failure to do so is the demise of the business. The Federal Government's spending, though, often fails to deliver real results. But the Federal Government does not meet its demise; rather, the all-too-often negative consequences fall on taxpayers and usually result in a new government program or one or dozens more.

But if we were thinking like a businessperson, we would consider the results that have come from past investments before making another.

Two-and-a-half years ago, the previous Congress and this current President implemented a stimulus that ultimately will cost Americans more than \$1 trillion. This mega-investment was supposed to create 3.5 million jobs. This investment was supposed to bring an unemployment rate of 6.4 percent last month. But what has actually hap-

pened? The President is more than 6 million jobs short and unemployment stood at 9.1 percent last month. That's not even counting the millions of Americans who are underemployed.

The Budget Control Act, which the President signed, was supposed to be about putting an end to Washington's business as usual: spend and borrow, spend and borrow some more. Yet when the President came before us here in this very room a week ago tomorrow, all we heard was a recycled idea: another stimulus, another \$450 billion exercise in excessive spending that will underperform and underdeliver.

Spend, spend, spend, raise taxes and borrow more to pay for that spending. Raise those taxes from the very individuals and businesses that can actually create jobs that will get the economy out of this rut and put millions of Americans to work. And along the way, let's demonize job creators. That's what happened in this Chamber.

I believe the Federal Government should function as efficiently and as effectively as a private business; but it, by no means, should be able to brag about a large budget that fails to deliver and which only adds to the red ink each year.

Before adding to the \$15 trillion in debt this country already has or sustaining more years of trillion dollar annual deficits, we have no choice, and the American people expect no less, cut current spending and cap future spending obligations and pass a balanced budget amendment.

I support this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another active member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

I think it's clear that this resolution is just not my cup of tea, but I can tell you if we followed the path that was just recommended, Republicans could drive us deeper into recession or even depression.

It's as if the Republicans who are here today wanted to start Halloween early because they keep trying to bring back to life, as if it were some zombie, the specter of debt default that has already caused us so many problems.

Building on their earlier success in sowing panic and reaping fear in our global financial markets that contributed to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit rating, these professional obstructionists are determined to keep trying to wreak havoc.

As families are demanding action on the economy, a response to jobs, the Republicans instead are focusing on pandering to a small group of people for whom reality doesn't seem to make much difference. The problem is reality has a Democratic bias when it comes to this question of the economy and job creation.

I think if the Republicans really want to help us close the debt gap, the best way to do that is to get this econ-

omy moving. An increase in economic growth will do more than any of the things that he just mentioned—some amendment that might be approved years from now—will do more to help us get the debt under control than most anything else.

Of course, how did we end up with the debt that we have today? Much of it is directly related to the policies of the Bush-Cheney years when Republicans were totally ignoring the issue of debt: unpaid wars, tax cuts based on the mythology that they would pay for themselves when they just dug us deeper into debt. And now we face the need to try to get our economy moving again. Their solution? Do less. Jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States.

I think one of the problems that we have here, and it afflicts the Democratic Party to some extent as well as the Republicans, but especially with our Republican colleagues, is that we've just got too many certified smart people here in Washington. They're so smart they know what they know; they just don't know what the American people are experiencing. You don't have very many people advising about this economic recovery.

Whoever had to drive a truck for a living? You don't have people who even had to worry about whether they could make their next truck payment. And you sure don't have people advising who've had their house foreclosed and had to move their family into a truck. But that's the plight that too many Americans face today, and we need to be responding to their legitimate concern that what we need to do is focus on the demand side of the equation and help improve demand and get this economy going again.

I like the idea of focusing on our roadways, our trucks, our crumbling bridges and the like, building the infrastructure that will help American business as well as the people who would do that construction work.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe that focusing on our infrastructure, our roads, bridges, our schools, focusing on what is happening inside our schools with so many teachers threatened with dismissal around the country with the cutback in State and local budgets, that's the kind of focus that can help get America moving and address the debt issues at the same time.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's empty political resolution so we can focus on what really makes a difference to working families across this country.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York, CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise against this resolution.

I had thought that the Congress had already passed this very, very embarrassing experience.

When you read the papers today and see the pain that exists throughout these United States, it is not Republican or Democratic pain. It's pain that they're feeling as a result of the lack of economic growth in our great country.

And when you see the number of years and decades that this Congress has approved the President's authority to increase the debt ceiling for the purpose of maintaining the fiscal integrity of our country and, therefore, the democracy-loving countries that depend on the credibility of our fiscal condition, I would have hoped that we would think of this issue not in terms of the political implications, but how does the world perceive us to be.

Quite frankly, without being political, in watching the debate the other night, it wasn't that it annoyed me, but I was just so embarrassed that the world might think that that represented the principles of my country, people laughing about execution and laughing about people dying.

I'm certain nobody in this body takes pride in that type of thing. But to go against the President's ability to maintain the integrity of the United States of America, I think it is just so wrong.

There are good reasons that we can't challenge as to why our polling as a body is so low.

□ 1400

I don't think anyone can walk away feeling proud—liberal, conservative—about what's going on. The reason is because people don't go to sleep at night worried about what we're doing and debating on the question of revoking, of giving the power to the President to protect the integrity of our great Nation. No. They're going to bed at night having hope that maybe tomorrow they'll get a job, that maybe they'll be able to guarantee their health insurance, that maybe their kids will have a better life, that maybe we'll stop fooling around, playing politics with the future of this great country, that just maybe, one day, we'll be more concerned about the lack of default and the credit of our country than our own reelections.

I know it seems absurd that we can wish that; but if you think about it, they're not talking about Democrats' polls being low, and they're not just talking about Republicans' polls being low. They're talking about all of us.

The greatest thing about America, far beyond our military and economic wealth, is the trust that people used to have in government. Once they lose that, whether they're poor or whether they belong to that small number of people who hold the Nation's wealth, then the country is in desperate trouble.

So I hope that people who witness this debate recognize that the opposi-

tion is not speaking for the country or the Congress, but probably for the Republican National Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This pointless exercise that the House has embarked upon here today illustrates the challenge that we have to try and deal meaningfully with the very real problems that America expects us to make progress on. This resolution has already been laid to rest in the Senate. It has been defeated. Ain't going to happen. So, no matter what the result of the hours of debate that we have here today, it will make absolutely no difference.

It is an extension of what happened with the totally manufactured crisis surrounding the debt ceiling earlier this year. The debt ceiling increase was to deal with bills that we had already incurred, for which Congress over the years had already approved the spending, and we'd borrowed the money for it. It made no difference about future debt. It made no difference about the spending commitments that had already been made. Yet we watched tremors go through international markets, not because America couldn't pay its bills, but because some politicians, for their own purposes, were willing to risk that America didn't pay its bills.

Unprecedented.

We've raised the debt ceiling over 100 times. There was no doubt that we would, in fact, honor our commitments; but there were people talking crazy enough that cast doubt. That, I think, at least in part, is why we have seen the markets in the United States be on a roller coaster and people watch their 401(k)s maybe become 301(k)s one afternoon before they go up a little again and then go back down.

It doesn't have to be this hard if, instead of a pointless exercise, we would spend some time on areas where actually Congress could come together and cooperate on dealing with the infrastructure crisis in this country, where there is broad support from the business community, organized labor, contractors, local government, environmentalists to move forward to rebuild and renew this country, putting not tens of thousands but millions of Americans to work in strengthening our country and our economy. We could be dealing with something like this, but we're not.

We could deal with reforms in agriculture that would put more money in the hands of America's farmers and ranchers, less in mega-agribusiness. We'd save money, and we'd improve the state of agriculture. While we're at it, we could probably improve the health of our children in school with their nutrition, but we're not dealing with that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Most tellingly, we should be accelerating the reforms that the last Congress enacted. When they started, most of them were bipartisan ideas that have been implemented, in some cases, by Republican Governors. The difference between what America spends on health care this year and what the second most expensive country, Switzerland, spends is \$3,000 a person, \$3 trillion over 10 years. If we could just spend as much as the second most expensive country in the world.

We ought to be working on things like this that will make a difference for America, put them back to work, have fiscal stability—and maybe regain a little confidence in the political process instead of pointless exercises like this. I hope—I hope—that we will get this out of our system, get down and get to work. America deserves our best, not our worst, which is on exhibit here today.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the 174 Republican Members of this House who voted with us in a bipartisan fashion just last month to avert the first Federal default in the Nation's history. It may not have been an easy vote for some, but it was the right thing to do to prevent a catastrophe that would have certainly shaken further our fragile economic recovery. Today's vote is no different.

I urge my colleagues to not give in to the political gamesmanship that Standard & Poor's cited as the very reason for its bleak downgrading of the United States' credit rating. We must reaffirm our commitment that America will meet its obligations, and we don't want to find ourselves politically explaining how we voted for it before we voted against it.

Make no mistake that voting in favor of this resolution will, in fact, lead to the very default we voted to avoid with the Budget Control Act. You cannot now be for default after having just voted against it. We must reject this resolution and move on to the real challenge of working with a bipartisan supercommittee to restore fiscal responsibility, revive our economy and, most importantly, re-instill confidence in the American citizen and the American business community.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentleman from New York have any more speakers?

Mr. REED. I have one additional speaker, and then I am prepared to close after that, I believe.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I know of the intentions of my colleagues across the aisle. You want to try to make America a better place.

We had the prior speaker indicate that tremors were sent through the financial markets because some politicians, for their own purposes, put the financial integrity at risk. The Democratic speaker before that indicated that we should not go against the President's ability to protect the integrity of the United States. The Democratic speaker before that said that no one was apparently advising Republicans who had missed a truck payment. Things like that.

Guess what. I know that was not intended to be misleading. I know the intent was not that, but the fact is some of us go home as we did in August.

□ 1410

Some of us get out into the far reaches, the most rural areas of America, our districts. We talk to those people. They're struggling with gas prices. They're struggling with gas prices. They are having all kinds of trouble making ends meet, and they cannot understand how the people that are sent to Washington as representatives don't get it, how we could come up here and we can't control our spending.

So I wanted to help illuminate those friends who are mystified as to what our own purposes were in opposing a debt ceiling bill that jacked up the debt ceiling and then says, you know, we are going to cut 1, maybe 2, 2.5 trillion over 10 years when everyone in this body either knows or needs a good education to know that there is not a court, there is no way in the world you can bind a future Congress into making cuts that they have not agreed to. You can't do that. It's not enforceable. So the trick here in Washington is to back load all of the massive cuts, have a little trickle of cuts now.

So our own purposes boil down to this: I didn't deserve to be born in America. None of us that were born here did. We weren't born here because in the womb we did something deserving of being born in America. We are the most blessed nation in the history of the world, and it's not because of what anybody living today has done. We were blessed. We were born here. So many have been able to immigrate here and be blessed because of what prior generations have done: the responsibility, putting their lives on the line in war, struggling through depression to be accountable, struggling through the earliest days when they pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Those people are the reason we have been blessed.

So to make clear about what our own purposes were in opposing that debt ceiling, that didn't really do any kind of significant cuts in the next year, 2

years, back loaded them for 10 years, because that's irresponsible. And if future generations have any hope at all of being blessed as we have been, it's up to us. We can't repay the people that paid the ultimate price and that scraped and saved and were responsible in Congresses for 200—well, not 200, but 150 years or so that lived within their means. We can't repay them, but we can repay them by being responsible for the future.

So to come in and to have a debt ceiling increase time after time after time is not a real debt ceiling. And it is not an adequate defense to say, well, Bush did it; well, Clinton did it; well, Bush did it before him or Reagan did it, and just go on down, Carter did it. At some point we have to be responsible for our own actions and quit playing the pointing game and say, look, our time is now. We are elected to be responsible now. Our own purposes are to be responsible for the debt that we are incurring now. The \$4.5 trillion more than has been brought in is pretty irresponsible. That's no way to go.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. But if you want the numbers, if we are only able to save a trillion dollars over 10 years, which is quite possible under the debt ceiling deal that passed, then it will take 150 years before the budget balances if we continue to cut 1 trillion every year, and it will only add about \$120 trillion to the 14 trillion we have now. If we could save 2 trillion every 10 years, then we are looking at 80 years before we balance the budget and only adding 72 trillion to the debt that we have.

That's irresponsible. This country won't be around in this form, this Congress, and therefore that is our special purpose for doing this. That is why we say it's time to stop the debt ceiling bill from where it was, get responsible, and propose real cuts so this Congress does what the people who are missing payments are trying to do—live within their means.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas I disagree with his position, but I respect it. I can understand that those who voted "no" will now vote "yes." What is not understandable is that those on the Republican side who voted "yes" are now voting "no."

I yield 4 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from the proud State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The previous speaker voted to go deeply into debt. Frankly, I voted for some of those programs myself, two of which were to support the efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. We didn't pay for them.

As has been said, I didn't vote for it initially, but I think it's a good program. We have made it better for the prescription drug program, and the

gentleman wasn't here when we passed that, but we didn't pay for it. He is correct: It doesn't matter which side didn't pay for it; we haven't paid for it.

This bill is about whether or not we are going to stand up and say, yes, we voted to pay for it but, guess what, we had our fingers crossed; we are not going to do it. We said we were going to do this. We took some tough action. Both sides joined together, both leaderships joined together and said we are going to do this.

Now, this bill is a phony. This is posturing. This is politics. This is pure politics because the United States Senate has already rejected this bill and only one House needed to reject it. We are going to have an extension of the debt.

The extension of the debt will simply mean that those items that we all voted on will be paid for, that we won't waltz on our debts, that America will pay its debts.

Now, this bill is about, oh, no, let's not pay our debts. Let's pretend that they don't occur, that we really don't have to pay them. America's waltzing on its debts really won't have much consequence; although the overwhelming majority of people believe that if we waltz on our debts it will have extraordinary consequences. In fact, it's having extraordinary consequences on our economy right now, as we speak. It's undermined the confidence in America that we had this confrontation about whether America was going to pay its bills.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution of disapproval which is transparently political and which will do nothing to secure our Nation's fiscal future. In fact, this resolution is premised on the assumption that the American people are ignorant—I don't believe that—ignorant about the nature of our debt ceiling and the sources of America's fiscal challenges.

As often as some in this House attempt to falsely persuade the American people that raising the debt ceiling means taking on more debt, we will be here to repeat the truth. This is about nothing more than paying the bills we have already incurred. The American people understand that fact, as evidenced by their disgust with the partisan brinksmanship that almost brought America to the brink of default.

What Americans want to see is us coming together to take real action on two issues they are deeply concerned about: jobs and our mounting deficit.

One of the most important things we can do to reduce the deficit is to create jobs, grow our economy, get people back to work.

The President has put forward the American Jobs Act, which incorporates many elements of House Democrats' Make It in America agenda to create jobs. I hope my Republican colleagues bring it to the House floor for a vote as soon as possible.

Over the long term, though, we must lay out a path to restore fiscal sustainability. And the only path that is feasible fiscally, politically, and morally is one that is balanced and asks everyone to pay their fair share, not let some of the special interests and favored few be left out of the obligations to bring fiscal responsibility to this Nation. All of us need to be included. A balanced solution is favored by an overwhelming majority of Americans and even three-quarters of Republicans.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. The Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction must put aside partisan politics and put some hard choices on the table, choices that encompass both spending and revenue, and we must support their efforts to reach agreement.

□ 1420

That's what the American people deserve. That's the difference between posturing on our fiscal future, as this vote today does, and leading on our fiscal future. I urge my colleagues, let's vote down this empty resolution which is a pretense, a pretend, a statement that we don't like debt. Nobody likes the debt we've incurred, and everybody ought to join together in paying it down.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an issue of responsibility. It's not easy. It's not always politically popular. We've incurred a debt. It is our responsibility collectively, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans to come together and pay down this debt and not pretend that simply by defeating a resolution, or passing a resolution of so-called disapproval—which is already a dead letter, and everybody on your side of the aisle knows it's a dead letter because the Senate has already voted.

This is just a statement that I don't like debt. None of us like debt. Let's join together and reduce it as we did in the nineties.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I just wanted to make sure the record was clear.

My dear friend from Maryland said there were those on this side who wanted to welsch on our debt, and that's not the case. The thing that we want to do is stop incurring debt. We are all about being good for the debt we incur. We don't want to welsch on any agreements. I didn't ask my friend for time, so my time is very limited. I just wanted to correct the record. We're not out to welsch on anything. We're here to say, let's quit incurring debt. That's the whole point.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we have already set

the parameters for this discussion. We can see by the throngs that are on the floor of the House how keenly important this is to the American people. The reason why I say that is because important discussions draw Members even away from their duties elsewhere. But we know that the reason why we are speaking to empty seats is, one, because the other body has resoundingly denounced and voted this particular provision down because we have reached a compromise, a respectable compromise that we realize we have to pay our bills.

But of course those who believe that they are not in the people's House, they can put this resolution on the floor because if they look to what the people want, 46 percent of the American people believe that jobs are more important than reducing the deficit. More than 65 percent believe we should be doing a jobs bill. We have the greatest poverty among children of all sectors in all areas of the country right now as I speak. And the new population of the impoverished are those recent college graduates. All of the stars in the eyes and excited parents who've paid large amounts of dollars to ensure that their young ones have an opportunity for a college education, there are no jobs.

Now, I don't concede to the fact that the only initiative that should come about should be from the government, but we are the umbrella on a rainy day. This is a small measure that the President has offered, a small, constructive measure, his jobs bill. It is balanced across the board. It provides relief for small businesses. It provides the jobs that they will create. It gives incentives to hire someone. It works with our larger companies as well. And, of course, it puts back to work what has been a devastating phenomenon in our communities, taking away firefighters, police and teachers. You're going to feel the pinch when your young children are in classes that are 50 and 60 persons. So this is realistic.

It also addresses the question of the 46.2 million Americans who are living in poverty. As I indicated, a disproportionate share of those are children.

So what we are doing today goes smack against what the people want, and this is the people's House. I am concerned that we are not only being redundant, but we're saying to the world: smack us as irresponsible. We have the money to pay our bills, but we want the word to go out: we are irresponsible. We're not paying any bills. We're not Greece, we're not Spain, we're not Italy. We are Americans, and we have the know-it-all and the commitment to be the greatest country.

I've never taken seriously the pundits about America's decline; but it is a decline if we get on the floor of the House and ignore the needs of our brothers and sisters, ignore the needs in the Northeast where there's been a devastating hurricane, ignore those in the Southwest where 1,400 homes have

been burned to the ground in Texas. Who is going to help those folks besides their private insurance? They need the Federal Government, the rainy day umbrella on a rainy day or when a fire is there, the hose for the fire.

So I ask my colleagues to consider being realistic and rational. Vote this down. Put a jobs bill on the floor and do what the people want, create jobs now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a Resolution of Disapproval intended to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling by \$500 billion as he is authorized to do by the debt ceiling agreement reached last month. This resolution will obstruct the federal government from meeting their financial obligations; measures like this one have already failed in the Senate. This is a colossal waste of valuable legislative time. The message has been heard loud and clear, we must address the debt limit; however another message is being muffled—the need to focus on jobs. Here we are once again with another proposal before the House that appears to throw caution to the wind. This joint resolution is gambling on our financial future, if this amendment passes then we will fail to raise our nation's debt limit and will allow our nation to default.

We should have learned a valuable lesson from what happened the last time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to suggest that we should allow our nation to default. The stock market reacted immediately and a well known credit company lowered our nation's credit rating. We need to maintain our creditworthiness to meet the needs of the very people we have been sent here to serve. I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in playing political games than creating jobs or improving the economy.

Attempting to prevent the President from raising the debt ceiling to pay for the needs of the country and functions of the government will only lead us to the brink of another crisis. This is a continued effort by my Republican friends to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public.

Instead of working toward a bipartisan job creation bill, congressional Republicans are attempting to constrain the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

There has been a consistent theme this Congress of failing to bring forward measures that will create jobs. My Republicans colleagues have set the agenda. They seem focused on cutting programs that benefit the public and those in need, while making no concrete attempt to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

In my district, the Texas 186, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program, SNAP, that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April

2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2010, there were 46.2 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the US Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than \$22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

Attempts to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling threaten our ability to keep paying for programs that benefit the least among us, and I for one, will not turn my back on the Americans who are the most in need of compassionate leadership and responsible governing.

Threatening an increase in the debt ceiling threatens our ability to pay for Medicare, which guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

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, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade, and last month, we were able to negotiate another compromise, and keep the country from default. I urge my colleagues not to undermine the agreement that was reached by attempting to block the President's ability to raise the debt ceiling.

Once again, the American economy hangs in the balance as the act of the President raising the debt ceiling becomes an irrelevant spending debate that is as unnecessary as it

is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

This resolution is a petulant attempt to undermine President Obama. The bill itself says it is a joint resolution "relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit". Exercise of authority. It does not say unlawful exercise of authority, or unconstitutional exercise of authority. The language of the bill itself makes it clear the President has the authority to raise the debt ceiling as indicated in the agreement reached on August 2.

Passing this resolution will not decrease spending; it will merely compromise our ability to pay for spending already authorized. This bill does nothing to reduce the deficit, or address the budget, it only risks our economic standing and ability to pay our nation's bills, while simultaneously hurtling the nation toward another debt ceiling crisis.

Instead of spending time on resolutions designed to cast the President in a negative light, it is time for this Congress to come together, and pass meaningful legislation that will benefit the American people. In his address to a joint session of Congress last Thursday, President Obama gave this body a great opportunity to achieve bipartisan, job creating legislation that will invest in small business, help families that have been struggling with chronic unemployment, assist veterans in finding jobs, and invest in our infrastructure.

It is time for a new sense of bipartisanship. It is time for Congress to work together to aggressively take on job creation. It is time to end these divisive tactics and compromise to encourage the rapid job growth the American people deserve. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to stand up and vote no on this partisan resolution; we can, and we must take this opportunity to declare our intent to do what is right, face what is hard, and achieve what is great.

Instead of attempting to embarrass the President, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together, and focus on passing legislation that will help the American people by improving the economy and creating jobs. Now is not the time for partisan malice, now is not the time for H.J. Res 77; now is the time for this Congress to do all it can to usher in a new age of American ingenuity and prosperity. H.J. Res. 77 is simply a way to engage in past battles, and I am voting against it in order to focus on the future.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York, Representative REED, for recognizing me, but most of all for bringing this resolution. I support it, and I urge everyone here to support it.

As you may remember, it was a two-step process when the debt ceiling was increased: an initial \$400 billion immediately to avert the possibility of a default. That has been done. But an additional \$500 billion will not go out if this

resolution passes. I think we need to slow down and take a look at our spending before we commit another trillion dollars of debt.

We did reduce next year's budget by, I believe, \$31 billion over last year. That's a good step. That's a step in the right direction, but it's only a small step when you realize that this year's deficit is \$1.3 trillion. So \$31 billion is only a small step in the right direction. So this would give us more time and seriousness of purpose to look at additional savings.

So with that prospect in mind, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's slow down the adoption of an additional half trillion of debt. I urge support.

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

Very briefly, in one sense this is a meaningless resolution. My guess is that opinion makers in this country and I think abroad will consider it not meaningful, that it's going through the motions.

But there is a real danger here, and that is what it says about the dynamics on the majority side. That's the worrisome thing. It isn't that we would slow things down. If this were to pass and become law, indeed, the ceiling would fall. We would go into default very soon.

And I guess what this resolution being allowed to be brought up says is that there's a feeling within majority ranks that we have to let some bring this up, and perhaps a lot who voted "yes" now in essence vote "no" in order to bring some kind of peaceful equilibrium within the ranks of the majority.

The problem is that we need to be able to reach across the aisle. Having set up a select committee, it says we need to worry less about the dynamics within our caucus or conference and more about reaching common ground.

□ 1430

That's why this exercise isn't meaningless. The danger is that it will become very meaningful and that we will become—this Congress—essentially handicapped, if not imprisoned, by the inability of the majority on this side to step up to the plate and realize that in order to solve our problems there needs to be a balanced instead of imbalanced approach; that we have to look at revenues as well as spending cuts. That's the significance of this being brought up here.

I think all of us need to take another look before we essentially change our votes. And, essentially, it would mean "signaling." It will be still more difficult than the present perilous path to make meaningful our effort to move ahead in this country to address the job needs in this country, and yes, to address the deficit, but mainly or essentially to get our economy growing again. If we don't send that right signal here today, and send the wrong signal, I'm afraid this vote will become too meaningful.

I strongly urge that people vote “no.” I strongly urge on the Republican side that those who stepped up to the plate last time, step up to the plate this time and not duck for what is essentially an internal political dynamic. The dynamics of this country in terms of jobs and job growth, those dynamics are too essential for partisan internal politics to reign supreme on this floor at this time.

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

I truly appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from Michigan, and I truly appreciate the debate that we’ve had today on this resolution.

It is time that we come together. As a member of the freshman class that’s come to Washington, DC, I can tell you it is not a group of radical extremists, but men and women who have left their families, who have left their businesses, and have come down here to Washington, DC to accomplish what needs to be accomplished, that is, to get the fiscal house of Washington in order; it is to have the ability and skill to deal with the economy and put people back to work.

We have the energy, we have the desire to reignite this country so that generations of our children and grandchildren will be able to enjoy the benefits that we have all benefited from. We come here sincerely to reach across the aisle to have an open and honest dialogue with each and every one of the Members of this House, and that is why this debate is such a positive thing, in my mind. Because we are now starting down the path of recognizing that the debt has to be dealt with once and for all, but at the same time we must work together to heal our country, to reignite our country’s economy so that people can afford the American Dream that they so deserve and as each and every one of us has always benefited from.

So I come here this afternoon and offer this resolution to send a message to the President, to the world, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we cannot take our eye off the ball. We have to do all things. Because we are in a historic time when the issues we face can no longer be pushed down the road. It is now time to lead. It is now time to come together and act for this great Nation, the United States of America.

In this vote, I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution to send that message that we will deal with the debt, we will deal with the economy, we will deal with the jobs, and we will create an environment upon which the private sector will blossom again and people will benefit for generations to come.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a resolution disapproving of President Obama’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit. The recent

decision by the President to raise the debt ceiling was not one made in haste or taken lightly, but rather it is one that absolutely must be made. The consequences of not acting are so grave that we could not let it be an option as it would do great irreparable damage to our economy. We played with fire last month, and although we ultimately approved an increase, we spooked world markets and caused an unprecedented downgrading of our country’s heretofore sterling credit rating. In brief, we must raise the debt ceiling to prevent a default on our Nation’s obligations, avert an international economic crisis, and prevent further harm from being visited upon middle class families.

My colleagues have failed to recognize the damage their political posturing is doing to our economy. We have wasted plenty of floor time on theater, and in the meantime have let our Nation dangle on the precipice of default. Instead of rehashing old arguments and playing the same political blame games, we should come together and focus on the main problem facing Americans today: jobs. When I was back home in Michigan during the August recess, I heard firsthand from my constituents about the urgent need to create jobs, regenerate our economy, and get America going again. People across our Nation are hurting and are sick of the inaction in Washington.

President Obama should be commended for taking the initiative on this important issue by unveiling the American Jobs Act. While we may disagree on the specifics of his proposal, it should be considered on merit alone and Congress should come together to reach consensus on what can be done to improve the economy. Resolutions such as this one are nothing but a distraction from this important mission, which is why I am voting against it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 186, answered “present” 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]

AYES—232

Adams	Benishak	Brooks
Aderholt	Berg	Broun (GA)
Akin	Biggert	Bucshon
Alexander	Bilirakis	Buerkle
Altmire	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Amash	Black	Burton (IN)
Austria	Blackburn	Calvert
Bachus	Bonner	Camp
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Campbell
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Canseco
Bass (NH)	Brady (TX)	Cantor

Capito	Hunter	Platts
Carter	Hurt	Poe (TX)
Cassidy	Issa	Pompeo
Chabot	Jenkins	Posey
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Coble	Johnson (OH)	Quayle
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Cole	Jones	Rehberg
Conaway	Jordan	Reichert
Cravaack	Kelly	Rigell
Crawford	King (IA)	Rivera
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Roby
Culberson	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Davis (KY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Kissell	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rokita
Dold	Lance	Rooney
Duffy	Landry	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Ross (FL)
Ellmers	LaTourette	Royce
Emerson	Latta	Runyan
Farenthold	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Scalise
Fitzpatrick	Long	Schilling
Flake	Lucas	Schmidt
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Fleming	Lummis	Schweikert
Flores	Lungren, Daniel	Scott (SC)
Forbes	E.	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Manzullo	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	Matheson	Shuster
Gallely	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Gardner	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Garrett	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Gerlach	McCotter	Smith (TX)
Gibbs	McHenry	Southerland
Gibson	McIntyre	Stearns
Gohmert	McKeon	Stivers
Goodlatte	McKinley	Stutzman
Gosar	McMorris	Sullivan
Gowdy	Rodgers	Terry
Granger	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	Mica	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary	Turner
Guinta	Mulvaney	Upton
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Hall	Myrick	Walden
Hanna	Neugebauer	Webster
Harper	Noem	West
Harris	Nugent	Westmoreland
Hartzler	Nunes	Whitfield
Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)
Hayworth	Olson	Wittman
Heck	Palazzo	Wolf
Hensarling	Paul	Womack
Herger	Paulsen	Woodall
Herrera Beutler	Pearce	Yoder
Huelskamp	Pence	Young (AK)
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Young (FL)
Hultgren	Pitts	Young (IN)

NOES—186

Ackerman	Clarke (NY)	Farr
Andrews	Clay	Fattah
Baca	Cleaver	Filner
Baldwin	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Barrow	Cohen	Fudge
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Becerra	Conyers	Gingrey (GA)
Berkley	Cooper	Gonzalez
Berman	Costa	Green, Al
Bilbray	Costello	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	Crowley	Hahn
Boren	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Boswell	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Himes
Buchanan	DeGette	Hinchee
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Capps	Dicks	Hirono
Cardoza	Dingell	Hochul
Carnahan	Doggett	Holden
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Holt
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Honda
Castor (FL)	Dreier	Hoyer
Chandler	Edwards	Insllee
Chu	Ellison	Israel
Ciilline	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Clarke (MI)	Eshoo	

Jackson Lee (TX)	Murphy (CT)	Schiff
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Schrader
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Schwartz
Kaptur	Olver	Scott (VA)
Keating	Owens	Scott, David
Kildee	Pallone	Serrano
Kind	Pascarell	Sewell
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Sherman
Langevin	Payne	Shuler
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Sires
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	Peters	Smith (WA)
Levin	Peterson	Speier
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Stark
Loeback	Polis	Sutton
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Luján	Rahall	Tierney
Lynch	Rangel	Tonko
Maloney	Renacci	Tsongas
Markey	Reyes	Van Hollen
Matsui	Richardson	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Visclosky
McCollum	Ross (AR)	Walz (MN)
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Wasserman
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Waters
Meeks	Rush	Watt
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Miller, George	T.	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
Moran	Sarbanes	
	Schakowsky	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Ribble Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Giffords	Nadler
Barletta	Grimm	Towns
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Yarmuth
Deutch	Marino	

□ 1502

Mr. DREIER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, GOODLATTE, WHITFIELD, ALEXANDER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 706, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2881

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for Representative HASTINGS of Washington to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2881 and be replaced with Representative HASTINGS of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING CUMBERLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Cumberland American Little League team from my home State of Rhode Island. Cumberland American reached its first Little League World Series after winning the New England Regional Championship. It was one of 16 teams out of 6,800 Little League All-Star teams that made it to the World Series in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Congratulations to Cumberland American for working so hard and for showing such great sportsmanship in the World Series. In my record book, Cumberland American is a champion, not because it drove in the most runs or caught the most fly balls, but because of the dedication and respect and sportsmanship they showed while playing this great game.

Little League baseball is more than a game. It's an enrichment activity that fosters community spirit and helps young people develop critical skills. The coaches, sponsors, Little League officials, and parents who cheered from the stands all played valuable roles in making Cumberland American a success and providing a safe and nurturing environment for these young people to grow.

Thank you to all who made this possible. Again, my congratulations to each of our Cumberland American Little League Baseball players.

CUMBERLAND, RHODE ISLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM ROSTER

Players: Jacob Glod; Austin Cabral; Stephen Dugas; Max Hanuschak; Cam Rosa; Connor Lavallee; Chris Wright; Connor Mastin; James Belisle; Thomas Faltus; Matt Murphy; Colin Cannata; Ryan McCormick.

Coaches: Dave Belisle; Chris Gold; Matt Wright.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that all of us, all 435 of us, went back to our districts during the August recess. Now, I would suspect that most every Member of this House heard what I heard. I suspect that all of us who were listening heard the same message: When can I go back to work? When will there be a job for me? I'm going to lose my house because I lost my job. I can't afford to put my kids through school. You guys have got to get the job engine working once again. You've got to get Americans back to work.

Well, we are back here at work, and we're probably at the 257th day of this Congress, and yet the Republican ma-

jority has yet to put one jobs-creating bill on the floor. Now, they put a lot of bills on the floor, all of which would actually reduce employment. You cut the budgets, you're cutting somebody's job.

Fortunately, last week, the President of the United States came before this Congress, stood there where the Speaker is now standing, and presented to the American people an answer to the question that all of us heard during the recess. And he said: We can and we will put Americans back to work when Congress acts on this jobs act.

The American Jobs Act is now before the United States Congress and the United States Senate, and it's time for us to act so that Americans can go back to work.

Some say we could delay until after the next election. It will be 17 months—just short of a year and a half—before the next Congress will be in session and we will be able to pass legislation. There is not an unemployed American in this Nation that can or wants to wait 17 months to get a job. We have the opportunity today to put Americans back to work with the American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act works. It works. Americans can immediately go back to work as soon as that legislation is passed by this House and the Senate and put on the President's desk.

This afternoon, we're going to take maybe an hour with my colleagues to talk about various parts of the American Jobs Act, and we're going to start right now with the Representative from Illinois.

JAN, if you would join us, you talked earlier about this very eloquently on the steps of the Capitol. Please share with us.

□ 1510

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me add a personal twist to all of this about jobs.

When I grew up in Chicago—I was the daughter of a furniture salesman and a Chicago public schoolteacher—the American Dream was alive and well. On my dad's modest income, we could afford a little house in a quiet, middle class neighborhood.

Back then, a man could work in the steel mills on Chicago's South Side—one good union job with family health care benefits and a decent pension—and really live a middle class life. The family could own a home and buy a car and even send the kids to college. That was the 1950s, and anything seemed possible if you were willing to work hard. Incomes were going up for everyone. Income inequality was shrinking, and Americans were experiencing the greatest growth in living standards in history. For most working families, that American Dream was in reach, and that was the normal.

But today, after decades of attacks on organized labor, the passage of tax policies that favor wealthy individuals and corporations, the growing disparity of income, the squandering of a