

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 186, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

YEAS—238

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

Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden

Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

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

| |
|------------------|
| Neal |
| Olver |
| Owens |
| Pallone |
| Pascrell |
| Pastor (AZ) |
| Payne |
| Pelosi |
| Perlmutter |
| Peters |
| Peterson |
| Pingree (ME) |
| Polis |
| Price (NC) |
| Quigley |
| Rahall |
| Rangel |
| Reyes |
| Richardson |
| Richmond |
| Rothman (NJ) |
| Roybal-Allard |
| Ruppersberger |
| Rush |
| Ryan (OH) |
| Sanchez, Linda |
| T. |
| Sanchez, Loretta |
| Sarbanes |
| Schakowsky |
| Schiff |
| Schrader |
| Schwartz |
| Scott (VA) |
| Scott, David |
| Serrano |
| Sewell |
| Sherman |
| Sires |
| Slaughter |
| Smith (WA) |
| Speier |
| Stark |
| Sutton |
| Thompson (CA) |
| Thompson (MS) |
| Tierney |
| Tonko |
| Towns |
| Tsongas |
| Van Hollen |
| Velázquez |
| Viscosky |
| Walz (MN) |
| Wasserman |
| Schultz |
| Waters |
| Watt |
| Welch |
| Wilson (FL) |
| Woolsey |
| Yarmuth |
| Young (AK) |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Bachmann | Giffords | Nadler |
| Barletta | Lewis (GA) | Waxman |
| Capuano | Marino | Webster |

□ 1322

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 711, I was attending a memorial service in Florida. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this week I missed several rollcall votes and I wish to state for the RECORD how I would have voted

had I been present: rollcall No. 699—yes; rollcall No. 700—yes; rollcall No. 701—yes; rollcall No. 702—yes; rollcall No. 703—no; rollcall No. 704—yes; rollcall No. 705—no; rollcall No. 706—no; rollcall No. 707—no; rollcall No. 708—no; rollcall No. 709—yes; rollcall No. 710—yes; rollcall No. 711—no.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon in pro forma session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

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

The House will consider a few bills under a suspension of the rules on Tuesday and possibly Wednesday. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow afternoon.

The House will also consider a short-term continuing resolution to fund the government, and Members are advised that the rule debate for that measure may take place on Tuesday. I do not expect the resolution, itself, however, to be debated until Wednesday.

Finally, we will take up H.R. 1705, the bipartisan Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation, otherwise known as the TRAIN Act, which will measure the full consequences of regulations on job creation and, in particular, the Utility MACT and Cross-State Air Pollution Rules.

If any additional legislation is added to next week's schedule, it will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. I note that he has indicated the CR will be considered sometime next week, either Tuesday, but most likely on Wednesday. It's my understanding that the supplemental for emergency requirements of FEMA will be included in the CR; is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman that what will be in the CR is the budgeted amount for all of fiscal year 2012, which is \$2.65 billion, will be in the CR, front-loaded. In other words, the agency will have access to all of those funds prior to the expiration of the CR November 18.

In addition to that, we have, as the gentleman knows, funded out of this

House the emergency supplemental, which was \$1 billion more than that which the agency had requested, all of which was offset. That, too, will be in the CR.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

When you say all of that has been offset, it is my understanding that in fact in the CR for 2011—not for 2012, but for 2011—there is a \$1.5 billion offset included; is that accurate?

□ 1330

Mr. CANTOR. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. And it's further my understanding that that offset, which is unusual in that, as the gentleman knows, during the Bush administration, as happens, we had natural disasters and emergencies—hurricanes, floods, even earthquakes—that require local governments and local agencies and individuals to respond, and we have responded to them with assistance, but the eight times that we did that during the Bush administration, we did not offset it. We did not offset it on the theory that this was an emergency that occurred that was unplanned for and that we would, in fact, obviously pay for it, but pay for it in subsequent years.

It's my understanding that the offset that is being considered is \$1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle fund. The problem with that, as I see it, is we are talking about creating jobs, and the President has presented a jobs bill. I'll talk about that in just a minute. But the fund that is in question to date has created 39,000 jobs, and the loan applications in progress are projected to create 50,000 or 60,000 additional jobs.

Therefore, if we use this as an offset, which would set a precedent, although I understand that precedent's not being followed for 2012, what we are doing, in my view, Mr. Leader, is undermining a specific item in the current scheme of things that is, in fact, creating jobs, as I said, 39,000 jobs, with the loan applications that are in progress now expected to create an additional 50,000 to 60,000 jobs, that we undermine that effort.

Frankly, on our side, we would hope that we could return to what is precedent, and that is, in an emergency, respond with emergency funding as we did throughout the Bush administration, not with the concept that we wouldn't pay for it. You and I both agree that paying for this is critically important, and in fact, I think you and I are both of the opinion that, hopefully, the committee of 12 is set up to look at how we get our finances back in line with our revenues and expenditures, that that needs to be done.

But certainly, this is a new precedent. And, unfortunately, it appears that you have targeted—I don't mean you, personally, but the CR would target a particular item that is exactly what we want to do, and that is creating jobs.

Would the gentleman like to comment on that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Sure, I do. And, Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is committed to paying for what we spend, and he, if anyone, would put as a priority that we ought to act accordingly.

I find it somewhat ironic that the gentleman is defending what occurred during the Bush administration, as I will posit what occurred during the Clinton administration, because President Clinton, under his administration, actually signed four separate supplementals that were offset, including flooding and the Oklahoma City bombing.

So the gentleman is correct; there's precedent on either side. I think he would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to begin to really put forth a concerted effort to act responsibly, not just say we're going to act responsibly and attempt to off-lay the obligation to the Joint Select Committee. We have an opportunity to do so now.

And the gentleman refers to the offset that some on his side have raised as an objection. I would say to the gentleman, the facts are: There's currently \$4 billion in unobligated budget authority remaining under the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program, and this so-called pay-for just rescinds a billion and a half of that total, and the program will have remaining in it \$2.5 billion.

I think it's worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that this money has been laying around since September 30, 2008. That is 3 years.

So I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone is intending to do anything damaging to potential job creation here. What we're trying to do is finally face facts. We in this body, in this town, must stop the Federal Government from continuing to spend money it doesn't have.

And I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course it's money the government doesn't have. As you know, revenues are at the lowest point they've been in some six decades in America—on one hand because we are not collecting revenue and, on the other hand, because people don't have money in their pockets to pay revenues. They're not working; therefore, they're not paying taxes, and therefore, revenues are down for those two reasons.

I would say to my friend that it's my understanding that the account that you have targeted has some \$3.9 billion in pending requests, which are the items that would lead to 50,000 to 60,000 new jobs.

Now, at a time when we're not creating sufficient jobs for our people—let's assume, for the sake of argument, you want to offset this money. You and I both agree it ought to be paid for. The question is: When do you pay for it? Do we pay for it right now?

The fact of the matter is, if you target this particular fund, you are tar-

geting a fund which has demonstrably grown jobs in America. Some 39,000 jobs have been created as a result of loans out of this fund. There is \$3.9 billion. You indicate there is still money in the account. You're absolutely right on that. But there are pending requests, again, which would result in 50,000 to 60,000 new jobs, which would be revenue creation for the Federal Government.

So, in fact, it appears that we may be cutting off our nose to spite our face here, and I would urge the gentleman to perhaps revisit this.

The gentleman mentioned the Clinton administration. As the gentleman will well recall, the concerns were not as high then because, during the Clinton administration, of course, we were creating over 3 million jobs per year on average so that the private sector was humming along very well and created 22 million jobs during the Clinton administration.

Unfortunately, that was not the case in the last administration, nor has it yet been the case in this administration, although there were 2 million jobs, as the gentleman knows, created in the last 20 months. However, the last 2 months have been stagnant, and that's not good for anybody. It's not good for Republicans or Democrats, but, more importantly, it's not good for the country. Therefore, I would urge us to make sure that we do not target a fund which has already demonstrably created jobs.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to the gentleman.

First of all, the gentleman knows good and well that the situation with the Federal debt was entirely different back under the Clinton administration times.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time. I do know that very, very well. We had surpluses, not deficits.

Mr. CANTOR. And there was also a Republican Congress that was at work trying to help job creation then at that time as well. So if one wants to claim, we both can claim credit. But as the gentleman knows, I prefer to look forward to see if we can work together.

So with that in mind, the gentleman, of anyone in this body, has been committed to trying to take a fiscally responsible approach, and that's what we're trying to do here. I would say to the gentleman, instead of just trying to claim numbers, as if there is some panacea going on here and as if the move to offset using funds obligated for this program would somehow threaten job creation, if you look at the numbers, this year, all that has been allocated from the available \$4 billion is \$780 million. That's all that's been allocated and approved under this program. Again, remember, the money has been laying around since September 30 of 2008. That's 3 years.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, the gentleman claims the 33,000 jobs that were actually created by this program, but many would

say that these jobs already existed at existing Ford Motor Company plants. And the administration, I know, has claimed that these jobs have been saved when there's no indication that, in reality, that is the case.

So, again, instead of trying to make all these claims and trying and continue to make promises that, frankly, can't be substantiated, what we're trying to do is do what every family's got to do around its table and every small business person has got to do at the end of each pay period—figure out how they're going to make it through the end of the month.

□ 1340

Just as if a family was facing a situation where they had saved \$25,000, \$30,000 and they wanted to use that money to buy a new car, and God forbid somebody got very sick that needed that money in their family. Most families are going to take that money and decide not to buy the new car and instead help the family member who needs it.

That's what we're trying to do here, Mr. Speaker. We're not trying to suggest that perhaps there isn't some laudable intent under this program. What we've identified is moneys unspent that have been obligated, moneys that apparently do not go out as quickly as the gentleman may suggest to, as he says and claims, create jobs, and take that money and prioritize it by saying it belongs to help the people in a disaster so they can get the relief they need.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response.

We could go back and forth on how many jobs were, in fact, created. My belief is that there were substantial numbers of jobs created by this fund and the prospect of those 50,000 or 60,000 jobs is real, not ephemeral, not just a debating point.

But I would say to my friend, my friend has been recently quoted, I'm sure accurately, perhaps—and correct me if I'm wrong—in saying that during the first 8 months we focused on cuts of our “cut and grow,” and now we need to focus on grow. I would tell my friend, assuming that quote is accurate, that, in fact, here we are again focused on cut, not on grow.

Clearly, whatever the specific number is, I think that is, frankly, not refutable, that the investment in advanced manufacturing technology vehicles is, in fact, going to make us more competitive globally, is going to enhance the ability to make it in America, not only to succeed in America but to make “it”—in this case, advanced vehicles which are competitive in the international markets.

This is a specific area where we have tried to invest in making sure that we make “it”—in this case, advanced technology vehicles—and I don't think it's good policy for us to be focused on cutting back on those areas which have the promise of growth and jobs. That is what I tell my friend.

Obviously, the gentleman is correct, but I want to tell the gentleman also that if you keep cutting revenues, as we did in 2001 and 2003, and then you keep escalating spending, as we did over the last 10 years, inevitably you're going to get to the point where that family is not going to have any revenues to pay its bills, as the gentleman points out.

But it's inevitable that when you continue to cut revenues and if you don't cut spending, you're going to be in trouble. That didn't happen in the last decade. It didn't happen in the last administration. In fact, as you know, exactly the opposite happened. We escalated spending more than we did under the Clinton administration; and, therefore, we find ourselves in a hole. The economy went into the tank, and it's struggling.

I agree with you. It doesn't matter why it's struggling, who's to blame. It's struggling. As a result, what the President has done is come before us and said, Look, here's a jobs bill. We need to build jobs. I'm not going to go through all the polling data. I'm sure my friend has seen it. There's a recent CNN poll which shows that the public, by big numbers, wants us to focus on creating, building, expanding jobs. And very frankly, the public believes that you need to invest to do that, by pretty good numbers.

I'm for disciplining spending. I will vote to discipline spending, but I don't think that targeting job-creation projects is the way to discipline it when Americans all over this country are really hurting because there are not jobs available for them.

I want to thank the gentleman for what I think are very measured and positive responses to the President's suggestion on how we create jobs in this country. I would ask the gentleman what plans the gentleman has and his party has to move forward on the legislation that the President has asked to create jobs, to invest in growing our economy, and to help those small businesses expand and create jobs and to help those who do not have any job and who are worried about how to put food on their family's table, as well as investing in infrastructure and keeping teachers on the job.

We think this legislation is critically important. We think the American people in the most recent CNN poll have responded very positively. They think this is a productive way to go forward.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there are plans to have the committees move forward or for us to move forward on this legislation?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman may have seen remarks I made earlier in this week and last week about the President's job plan. What I said is there is a lot of area I think that we can actually work together on. I do reject the President's demand for an all-or-nothing approach, that perhaps his way is the only way, because there are items in the Presi-

dent's plan that we take strong disagreement with.

So I do think the American people do want us to try and drive towards results here, and I do think there are some areas we can work on together.

We support the extension bonus depreciation. We support removing the pending application of the withholding on government contractors. We support facilitating and increasing small business access to capital. We support incentives to hire veterans. We support reforming the unemployment insurance system in this country, free trade agreements. We would love to entertain serious discussions on how you reform this system so that we can get a better return and improve infrastructure spending in this country.

There are many areas. Small business tax relief, the President discussed. We have our own ideas. As the gentleman knows, the House is proceeding on our agenda for job creation. It's rolling back regulations that are impeding job growth, the one that was just passed prior to the Members leaving the Chamber today. We will have one every week that we believe, after having consulted with small businesses around this country, are getting in the way of their jumping back in the game of job creation.

So we all have ideas. It's not just the President's plan that will come up in this House. We are going to work together to find areas of agreement.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman to achieve that end so that, yes, the middle class in this country can get back to work as we see small businesses beginning to rev up again towards an economic recovery.

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

I also want to say that, yes, I have seen his comments. I think they have been positive. I think the gentleman has just gone through a list on places where we can, perhaps, find common ground. What we need, of course, is a vehicle, hopefully on this floor in the very near future, in which to find common ground and also to offer alternatives that each of our parties or individuals in this House think will, in fact, grow the economy and create jobs. I think that would be very useful.

The President indicated in his speech a sense of urgency that the American people feel. They gave us that message very loud and clear. I think all of us share that message. To think about somebody being unemployed for 3 months or 6 months or 18 months or 2 years, not want to, and have the ability to work and can't find a job is a crisis, is in fact a depression in that person's life—not only psychologically but actually.

So I would urge the gentleman to bring something to the floor as soon as possible that incorporates that on which we can agree and gives us an opportunity to offer solutions that, perhaps, the House will agree on. And if not, we won't agree.

I also welcome the gentleman's rejection of the philosophy of "my way or the highway." We welcome that recognition, that, in fact, we have to reach compromise if we're going to move this country forward.

If I might in closing, let me, perhaps, ask you about the schedule longer term than next week.

□ 1350

Obviously, we have a special committee. I think the gentleman and I are both committed to—I know I am committed to—the success of that committee. I think it is absolutely critical to give our business community confidence, to give our people confidence, and to give the international community confidence that this government can, in fact, work and can address very serious problems—in this case, the debt and deficit—but also confront the problem of growing our economy. As both the Bowles-Simpson Commission and the Rivlin-Domenici Commission said, we ought to address both. That's what the jobs bill is about, and that's what the special committee is about.

Does the gentleman have any thoughts in terms of the probability of the schedule that you have issued that indicates that we'll get out on December 8? As we know, the committee has to be voted on by December 23. That doesn't mean we have to wait until the 23rd, assuming the committee comes out with a positive report.

Could you elaborate somewhat on what you see the schedule to be and the certainty with which Members can plan based upon the schedule that has been issued given what faces us?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I think, as the gentleman knows, we've been really trying to stick to the schedule and to afford Members some certainty so that they can schedule their business and their time with their constituents in their districts. The hope is at this point for us to absolutely stick to the schedule. We, at this point, have no changes in the recess times.

As for whether we are going to go longer than December 8, obviously the work of the joint select committee bears greatly on that. As the Speaker and as the gentleman knows, the joint select committee is expected to report by November 23. If all goes well, we should be able to live up to the schedule as printed. Again, it all depends on the work of the joint select committee.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his time today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LANDAU EUGENE MURPHY, JR.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, America has voted. The Nation voted for a winning combination of humility, hard work, a lifelong dream, and finely tuned talent. Today, I join with my friends and colleagues from Logan County, West Virginia, in congratulating Landau Eugene Murphy, Jr., this year's winner of NBC Television's "America's Got Talent."

Landau's journey is a true American success story. Coming from humble beginnings, he worked hard, never lost faith in his Lord, and always remained determined to pursue his dream.

I believe what Landau accomplished last night should stand as an example to every young person throughout this great Nation. He has shown them that they should always set their goals high and work until they get there; and indeed, if you should take some blows, just let the record show you did it your way.

I send my very best to Landau, his lovely wife, Jennifer, and their family as they begin this new and exciting journey in their lives. I know that Landau remains as humble today as he was when he first took the stage at the Logan County Arts and Crafts Fair's annual talent show some years ago.

I commend the Logan County Chamber of Commerce, the Hatfield-McCoy Convention and Visitors Bureau, and Diana Barnette, and all the fine folks at Fountain Place Cinema 8 in Logan, West Virginia, for their support of their hometown hero. As we have always done in West Virginia, we stand behind and support our own, and the work these organizations and individuals have done is phenomenal. Undoubtedly, their efforts were instrumental in Landau's victory.

Mr. Murphy accepted his victory with the high fives of his competition—the hallmark of good sportsmanship. Throughout the weeks of competition, he often spoke of his respect, compassion, and friendship with his opponents—a timely lesson for us all.

I hope my colleagues will congratulate all those whose talent carried them to the final weeks of a long competition. I thank America for recognizing a true talent in this fine son of West Virginia. Thankfully, we will be

hearing a lot from him in the many years to come.

HONORING CORPORAL DAKOTA MEYER

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my fellow marines and a truly brave and heroic American, Corporal Dakota Meyer. This week, Corporal Meyer is receiving the highest military honor our Nation has to offer, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

As a scout sniper with the Third Battalion, Third Marines, Corporal Meyer ran through enemy fire multiple times in an attempt to save fellow U.S. servicemembers in Kunar province, Afghanistan. Facing enemy fire, Corporal Meyer killed at least eight bad guys, personally evacuated 12 friendlies, and provided cover for another 24 of his fellow marines and soldiers during the 6-hour battle.

Corporal Meyer had, no doubt, distinguished himself above and beyond the call of duty, and truly is an American hero. He knowingly risked his own life to save the lives of others. I congratulate him on this honor.

Semper Fi, Corporal Meyer.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

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

Mr. COHEN. On the 17th of September in 1787, the United States Constitution was ratified. Senator Byrd in the year 2005 introduced the House-passed Constitution Day. So, this weekend, we'll be celebrating Constitution Day.

When I think of the Constitution, I think of Dr. Martin Luther King and the right to peacefully assemble, which is enshrined in the First Amendment. That meant he could go to Selma, that he could come to Washington and fight for civil rights and secure those rights for the people of this Nation.

I also think of women's rights embodied in the 19th Amendment. Women were given the right to vote—Tennessee being the perfect 36th State to give women that right to vote.

I think of a woman's right to choose, which is given through the Constitution and the Bill of Rights—in the Ninth Amendment, the Fourth and through the First and Third as well.

But that is just the tip of the iceberg. The Constitution embodies the fundamental values of this Nation: freedom, fairness, justice, and equality. We haven't always lived up to the Constitution's ideals; but with the rights it guarantees and the freedoms it protects, we can continue to move forward and be the more perfect Union that it promises.