

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. The EPA did an economic analysis looking at the cost and benefits. And on the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, they said that the costs would be less than a billion, but the benefits would be up to \$280 billion per year, 150 to 350 times its cost.

I want the chairman of the subcommittee to answer a question when he closes. I believe the Republicans have misrepresented this bill during the debate, but false information was put on their Web site tonight. They claimed hundreds of groups support the TRAIN Act, and immediately two groups came forward, and maybe others will as well, saying that they would never support the TRAIN Act—Clean Water Action Committee and the Clean Air Watch.

I'd like to know if the information that is on the Web site is being checked for accuracy, because I know that a lot of things that have been said in this debate from the other side of the aisle have not been accurate.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the gentleman for the debate today. I was not aware that we had sent out a letter of supporters of this legislation, and evidently in that letter there was a letter in opposition that should not have been in there. If that created any hardship for anyone or problems, we certainly do apologize for that.

We should remind ourselves that by every public health measure, from infant mortality to life expectancy, we are healthier today and are exposed to fewer hazards than ever before. Our present day air is much cleaner now than years ago thanks to EPA, and our air quality is among the best in the world. And we recognize the importance of EPA. However, when EPA becomes so aggressive, as this EPA has become, and in a very short period of time they've come forward with 14 regulations—and we know that when you look at cost-benefit analyses, different entities come up with different figures on the cost and the benefits.

We, for example, have come up with an analysis on the Utility MACT and the air transport rule alone saying that the annualized cost of that will be \$17 billion, that industry will have to spend that kind of money to get new equipment, that the total cost between 2011 and 2030 would be \$184 billion. But one of the figures that really scares you in this is that they say there will be a net loss of 1.4 million jobs. Now, we know that some jobs will be created in trying to build this equipment that these regulations are going to require, but most of the analyses that we've seen indicate that there is going to be more of a job loss.

□ 1950

All the TRAIN Act is doing is saying let's have an independent government

agency, including EPA, do an analysis of cost/benefit of all of these rules. We would also like them to look at what impact does it have on America's ability to be competitive in the global marketplace. We'd also like for them to look at what will be the job loss, net job loss. We would also like for them to look on what impact it's going to have on electricity prices as well as the reliability of electricity.

And on 12 of those regulations, we do not stop them in any way; but on two of them, the ones that are most costly—Utility MACT, and what I refer to as the "air transport rule"—we do, in this legislation, delay the effective date of those, the implementation of those until 6 months after the report is due that this legislation requires.

Now, in my view, that's not being unreasonable. Some people think it is because it is the first time that Congress has ever come to the floor to question some of the EPA regulations, and I really think that that's our responsibility. They issue the regulations; but if they reach a point where we think they're being unreasonable, then we have an obligation to come and let's examine these, let's look at them before we move totally forward with it.

Now, Lisa Jackson, when she has come before us and testified, she has always made the comment that "I'm creating jobs with these new regulations." And as I said earlier, she does create new jobs, but the net effect in there is a loss of jobs. Now, some of these rules may be great in areas like California and New York and the Northeast and elsewhere; but in the areas of the country where coal—and, by the way, coal still provides 50 percent of all the electricity in America. Our electricity demand is going to increase significantly in the next 30 years, so we're going to have to rely on coal. But a lot of these regulations are going to put coal miners out of business because they're going to close some of these coal mines. It's going to put some coal-fired utilities out of business because they're going to close these utility plants because the cost is not going to be worth what they have to do to meet these air quality regulations.

Now, on the air quality regulations, the question becomes, if you're 98 percent pure already, is it worth this much money to go 2 percent more? So that's the question we come down to, and that's why we ask for this analysis; and I would urge everyone to support this TRAIN Act legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2141

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-215) on the resolution (H. Res. 412) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of such report. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good

friend from Rochester, New York, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

All time that I will be yielding and that my friend from Rochester will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through what James Madison, the author of the Constitution, has described as an ugly, messy, difficult process. That's the legislative process. And while many of us have been frustrated, it does work at the end of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it has to work. It has to work because our fellow Americans are suffering at this moment.

I have just been talking to staff members of the House Appropriations Committee, and we have to get the resources to those people who are suffering ASAP. As of this morning, there was a grand total of \$212 million in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's fund to deal with these disasters that have taken place. Last spring, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Ms. Napolitano, testified that we needed additional resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's go back to last spring and realize that was before we had hurricanes. It was before we had floods. It was before we had tornadoes that hit the Midwest. Think of those poor people in Joplin, Missouri, all those homes and lives that were lost. And it was before we had this earthquake that, as we all know, damaged the Washington Monument right down the street from where we are.

Mr. Speaker, it's very important that we get those resources there, with only \$212 million as of this morning. With expenditures somewhere in the neighborhood of 30-plus million dollars each day, it means as early as Monday of next week we could end up with nothing, nothing for those people who are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we don't want the government to shut down. We want to make sure that the people who are truly in need are able to have the resources necessary. But at the same time, we recognize that we have a \$14.5 trillion national debt. We have massive deficits that are before us, and we need to do everything that we can to do what people across this country are saying needs to be done—we need to create jobs. We need to generate an increase in our gross domestic product growth, and the measure that is going

to be before us when we report out this rule will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the measure that we will consider is identical to the measure that we considered in the House yesterday, the measure that had been reported out, basically the same package that we had last week. But a bipartisan request that was made by the Senate majority leader, Mr. REID, and the Senate minority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, was that we have this provision considered as a Senate amendment so that the Senate would be able to move as quickly as possible to ensure that our fellow Americans have the resources that are necessary. And so that's why we have ended up with the same measure that we had yesterday.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you and I have discussed in the meeting that we were just in, there has been a change. There is a very minor change. It is one single paragraph. So of the continuing resolution that we had, which is \$1.043 trillion, exactly what we had yesterday, no change, in full compliance with the 3-day layover requirement that exists in the House rules—and I will remind my colleagues the measure that's before us was put online on Monday, 4 days ago, so, again, in full compliance with time to spare to meet the 3-day layover, with one amendment. The amendment reads as follows:

“At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

“Section 142. Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Title 17—Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program’ pursuant to title IV of division A of Public Law 111-5, \$100,000,000 is rescinded.”

That is the only change that has been made. Let me tell you why that change was made, Mr. Speaker, and I don't often read *The Washington Post* on the House floor, but today's *Washington Post* has an article that explains what it is that led us to call for using the \$100 million that I just mentioned as an offset.

I recognize, as one of my colleagues in the Rules Committee stated earlier, we know that this company known as Solyndra, which Democrats and Republicans alike recognize has been an abject failure for this energy program, is one that will not get resources because they have gone bankrupt.

But let me just tell you what led to us focusing on this \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we never again have another boondoggle like Solyndra. This is, again, today's *Washington Post*, in an article entitled, “Solyndra's Ex-Employees Tell of High Spending, Factory Woes.” It reads as follows:

“Former employees of Solyndra, the shuttered solar company that exhausted half a billion dollars of taxpayer money, said they saw question-

able spending by management almost as soon as a Federal agency approved a \$535 million government-backed loan for the start-up.

“A new factory built with public money boasted a gleaming conference room with glass walls that, with the flip of a switch, turned a smoky gray to conceal the room's occupants. Hastily purchased state-of-the-art equipment ended up being sold for pennies on the dollar, still in its plastic wrap, employees said.

□ 2150

“As the \$344 million factory went up just down the road from the company's leased plant in Fremont, California, workers watched as pallets of unsold solar panels stacked up in storage. Many wondered: Was the factory needed?”

“‘After we got the loan guarantee, they were just spending money left and right,’ said former Solyndra engineer Lindsey Eastburn. ‘Because we were doing well, nobody cared. Because of that infusion of money, it made people sloppy.’”

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that our fellow Americans are suffering across this country because of the tremendous very, very sad disasters that we have faced over the last weeks and months, and it is very important for us to recognize that every taxpayer dollar is precious, especially in these times when there are people losing jobs, losing their homes, and losing their businesses.

This is a very sad and tragic example of the kind of waste that is there, and that is why the one very small but important modification to the measure that is before us will be to take \$100 million and use that additionally as an offset to ensure that the hard-earned dollars of the American people are not wasted in the way that we have seen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my speech today will be very much like my speech yesterday, but then so is the bill. Yesterday the House on both sides of the aisle defeated the majority's first attempt to pass a continuing resolution. And here we are 24 hours later with the very same bill. Let me repeat, the bill we're debating today is barely changed from the one that was defeated yesterday. The bill still contains unacceptable cuts to an essential manufacturing jobs program to pay for equally essential disaster relief.

Homes have been destroyed. Roads have collapsed, and local economies have been disrupted by a seemingly endless stream of hurricanes, tornadoes, tropical storms, and extreme weather that has crisscrossed our land. Our moral compass makes it very clear. We know what we need to do. We

must come to the aid of our fellow Americans who need our help. The problems they are facing are monumental, and quite simply, no one can recover from such natural disasters on their own. They need our help.

Yet the majority's efforts to hold disaster relief hostage to unacceptable cuts is as unwise today as it was 24 hours ago.

As I said yesterday, when it comes to spending billions of dollars on two wars that are bankrupting us, the majority's concern for spending is nowhere to be found. Since 2004, American taxpayers have spent over \$3.4 billion as emergency spending on infrastructure in Afghanistan, and even more in Iraq. Not a single one of these \$3.4 billion was offset, but were paid for by the same taxpayers that are being denied taxpayer money now. While we send billions of dollars to Iraq, the Iraqi government has begun building. They announced today a high-speed rail system to connect Basra to Baghdad. That's the same week that the majority in this House took all of the high-speed rail away from the United States. And so we will be paying for 280 miles in Iraq, but we can't pay for it from Buffalo to Albany.

When it comes to Americans in need, when it comes to helping women, children, and families whose homes have been washed away, the majority has decided they just can't help unless they get to take the money from a program that has created 39,000 jobs and is poised to create 60,000 more.

The bill was wrong yesterday, and it's wrong today.

Let me just give you some information from me, I believe, The New York Times. The headline says, "Republicans Sought Clean-Energy Money for Home States." Senator MCCONNELL asked for \$235 million for an electric vehicle plant in Kentucky; Representative LAMAR SMITH asked for stimulus money for a solar plant in Texas; Congressman FRED UPTON wanted five clean energy projects in Michigan; Representative CLIFF STEARNS asked for a lithium ion battery manufacturing plant in Florida. These requests for funding came from the very same program that has been discussed being cut these last 2 days.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand by your beliefs. If you thought the bill was wrong yesterday, there is no reason to think the bill is better today; virtually nothing has changed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this flawed bill.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 2011]

REPUBLICANS SOUGHT CLEAN-ENERGY MONEY FOR HOME STATES

(By Eric Lipton)

WASHINGTON.—On the Senate floor and the television airwaves, Senator Mitch McConnell has lambasted the Obama administration over what he has described as its failed efforts to stimulate new jobs through clean-energy projects backed with billions of dollars in federal loans or other assistance.

But Mr. McConnell, of Kentucky, is one of several prominent Republicans who have worked to steer federal money to clean-energy projects in their home states, Energy Department documents show.

Mr. McConnell made two personal appeals in 2009, asking Energy Secretary Steven Chu to approve as much as \$235 million in federal loans for a plant to build electric vehicles in Franklin, Ky.

"I hope you will realize the importance of such job creation to Kentucky," Mr. McConnell said in a July 2009 memo supporting an application from Zap Motor Manufacturing.

Federal lobbying disclosure records show that Mr. McConnell's support for the project came after Zap Motor hired a Kentucky-based lobbyist, Robert Babbage, who has been a frequent contributor to Mr. McConnell's campaigns and boasts on his own Internet site about his close ties to Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Babbage declined to comment on the project. Gary Dodd, chief executive of Zap Motor, said the intervention by Mr. McConnell came after the company asked him to push the Energy Department to approve the loan.

Mr. McConnell's office, in a statement, defended his actions, saying, "There was no effort to push the administration to short-circuit its due diligence simply to plan a ribbon-cutting."

Mr. McConnell's high-level advocacy took place despite early struggles for the project, including the financial collapse in 2008 of its first Kentucky business partner, Integrity Manufacturing. Mr. McConnell made no mention of these stumbles as he pushed for federal money, simply saying Zap Motor might create as many as 4,000 jobs in his state.

Recently, he has joined with other Republicans in criticizing a March 2009 decision by the Obama administration to provide a \$535 million government-backed loan to a California solar-panel manufacturer, Solyndra, which recently filed for bankruptcy and is now the subject of inquiries by the F.B.I. and Congress.

"The White House fast-tracked a half-billion-dollar loan to a politically connected energy firm," Mr. McConnell said Thursday in remarks on the Senate floor. "This place was supposed to be the poster child of how the original stimulus would create jobs."

Another Republican, Representative Lamar Smith of Texas, recently asked Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. to appoint an outside investigator to determine how the Department of Energy distributes clean-energy money. But in 2009, Mr. Smith wrote to Mr. Chu asking him to approve loan guarantees from stimulus money for a Texas project proposed by Tessera Solar, documents show.

Representative Fred Upton, Republican of Michigan and another critic of the Energy Department program, signed letters along with other members of the Michigan delegation in 2009 and 2010, pushing at least five clean-energy projects in his state, including a \$207 million loan request from EcoMotors International. And Representative Cliff Stearns, Republican of Florida, praised the opening last year of a lithium-ion battery manufacturing plant in his state, which relied upon an Energy Department grant.

Mr. Smith, along with the others, defended their actions, saying lawmakers can be critical of the Energy Department programs while still seeking money.

"I wanted to support Texas companies in their applications for grants," Mr. Smith said in a statement. "It is the responsibility of the Obama administration to carry out the necessary financial reviews of these proposals."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply say when Ms. PELOSI was Speaker of the House of Representatives, my friend from Rochester chaired the Rules Committee. The disaster relief provided in the response to Hurricane Katrina was partially offset. This is not in any way unprecedented. It's the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House is badly broken. This Republican leadership is out of touch. This process is a disgrace. This is not the way the people's business is supposed to work. We are now debating a continuing resolution that has the same objectionable provisions that were rejected yesterday on a bipartisan basis. Plus it has additional provisions that cut jobs. It's even worse.

So here's the deal: what's objectionable to people like me is my Republican friends continue to insist on cutting programs that will result in the elimination of American jobs. Their view is simple. If you want to help victims of tornadoes and hurricanes, then we have to pay for it, and we pay for it, in their view, by cutting jobs—not tax cuts for millionaires; not subsidies for Big Oil; not cutting incentives that encourage sending American jobs overseas. What they're advocating is cutting American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership, in my opinion, doesn't have a clue. They are obsessed with cutting government at all costs, including programs that help sustain American jobs, including programs that help prevent the elimination of American jobs. And here's the deal. The issue is jobs. They may not want to hear it, but the central issue before our country is jobs. I don't care where you go in this country, what people want to talk about is jobs and the creation of jobs as a way to secure our economy. What we should be talking about on the House floor tonight is jobs. What we should be talking about on the House floor tomorrow is jobs. What we should be talking about every day until the American people are back to work is jobs.

Instead, under this Republican leadership, we're debating trivial issues passionately and important ones not at all. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to, at a minimum, allow Democrats to bring up the President's jobs bill so we can put people back to work.

The best way to reduce the debt in this country is to put people back to work. Even a slight drop in the unemployment rate in this country would result in an incredible reduction in our debt.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this continuing resolution because it is

about eliminating jobs. It's not about creating more jobs; it's about eliminating jobs. Reject this continuing resolution because it plays politics with the lives of American citizens who have been victimized by natural disasters.

I urge the Republican leadership to, at least in this one instance, try to be bipartisan. We talk about an open House. We talk about bipartisanship. Here's an opportunity for us to be bipartisan. Let's work together on behalf of the American people. Let's get this bill right, and let's focus on jobs. That's what the American people want. This bill falls far short of that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell my friend from Worcester that clearly jobs is the priority that we are focused on. I appreciate very much and would like to associate myself with his remarks when he talked about the need for us to focus on job creation and economic growth. And I know I'm speaking for everyone, everyone on our side of the aisle, when we say we want to work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we can get our economy growing and so that the American people who are hurting will be able to have job opportunities.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2200

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources. This combines a speech he would have made yesterday with one he's going to do this evening.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Write today's date down, September 22, 2011. The Republicans are now in open warfare against clean energy. Yesterday was an opening salvo, but today is the declaration of war. They've already gutted clean energy research and development budgets by 40 percent for next year. Their budget for the next 3 years promises to cut those investments by 90 percent. They've zeroed out loan guarantee programs for all renewable energy in their budget while leaving intact \$25 billion for the nuclear industry. They're prepared to shut down the government rather than rescind one penny of the oil and gas industry's \$41 billion in tax subsidies. But clean energy sector gets the hammer.

Yesterday, in a gratuitous assist to Big Oil, Republicans tried to kill the Clean Car Factory Fund in order to pay for natural disaster relief. This is the program that is helping American companies manufacture superefficient vehicles that reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign oil from OPEC. But, apparently, that bill wasn't radical enough for the Tea Party base. So tonight, they come back and they're launching their full-frontal assault on clean energy. Yesterday, it was just

clean cars. Today, it's solar energy, wind energy and all renewables. Tonight, they take out the full assault attack.

But a word of warning. Up to a dozen projects are prepared to receive the green light in the next week. swooping in and destroying this program now will destroy these projects and destroy the thousands of jobs that will come with them. So before you vote for this bill, check and see if your State is one of the 38 that has received support under this program. Check and see if your State is one of the 12 that could have a new project announced next week. Make sure that the 66,000 people that have jobs today as a result of this program are not from your State. By the way, those 66,000 jobs created through this program are far more than any jobs created through legislation passed out in the first 9 months that the Republicans have controlled the United States House of Representatives.

So our planet is warming and extreme weather is increasing; 100-year floods and droughts are now striking every few years. Hurricanes have caused floods, massive power outages, and deaths. Texas has been on fire after having the hottest summer ever recorded. The President has issued disaster relief declarations in 48 States so far this year. Eighty-three major disasters declared in 2011, the all-time record; 3 more months to go this year. Wake up. Wake up. You can't kill these programs. This is the solution you are killing.

Republicans say, fine, we'll provide emergency relief for those who have been afflicted by nature's wrath in an ever-warming planet, but we won't do it unless we can cut the funds for the programs that promise to be the solution to the problem. That's what they're proposing here tonight.

Does the majority ask if we can save money by cutting the hundreds of billions of dollars we are planning on spending, the Republicans are planning on spending on new nuclear weapons being constructed over the next 10 years when we don't need any more nuclear weapons? No. Can we cut the tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies we pay to Big Oil and King Coal? Of course not. But wind, solar, clean cars, all-electric vehicles and plug-in hybrids, oh, yeah, let's cut that program tonight to fund disaster relief for people in this country suffering from weather, from floods, from hurricanes, and from tornadoes caused by an ever-changing climate.

This bill is an embarrassment. This is not worthy of this Congress. Vote "no" on this latest Republican assault plan to kill the clean energy industry in this country on behalf of the Big Oil and Big Coal industries.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to say to my friend that there have been 1,100 jobs lost at Solyndra. We want to make sure that there is never

again, never again another Solyndra. That's the reason that we have focused on the \$100 million as an offset in this measure, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's also very important to note this morning when I woke up I heard the news that General Motors is now in the midst of an international partnership in the People's Republic of China to deal with the development of electric vehicles. These are the kinds of things that the private marketplace is pursuing. I live in Los Angeles, California, where we have very serious air quality problems, and we just got the news today that Washington, D.C. is number six in the Nation when it comes to air quality problems. We want to make sure that we have energy-efficient automobiles. We are determined to do that. We need to make sure, we need to make sure that those companies that are out there pursuing these kinds of alternatives that, frankly, in most all cases are free, are free of government grants, are able to succeed with that; and that's why we have proceeded with that.

If my friend would like me to yield, I'm happy to yield to him.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman. I'm glad you brought out the General Motors deal because the General Motors deal is only possible because of the grants and the loans that have been given for the batteries and for the new technologies under these programs that are now making it possible for General Motors to reinvent.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend that obviously we have seen the General Motors deal proceed. The fact of the matter is it's not solely because of that that we are seeing this kind of partnership. But, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the private sector proceed with a policy that I believe very strongly in, and that policy is being pro-environment and is, in fact, pro-business.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield myself 1 minute to respond to the General Motors-China issue.

Earlier this week, The New York Times had a wonderful article in the business section that the Chinese were subsidizing electric cars to the tune of \$19,000 which all of us know is against every trade law the world has ever seen. But they were going to sell the Volt, and GM announced—they actually told them that in order to sell the Volt at all in China they had to give over all of their technology and all the information they had on how to build that car. I thought they weren't going to do it, but I also read yesterday that now they've got a brand-new Chinese partner, and they're giving them all the technology. I've got some legislation to bring into that, Mr. Speaker. I think it's outrageous that that's what's happening to American manufacturers.

I would like to now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan who

knows a thing about General Motors, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, here we go again. You tried to cut jobs last night. You lost. Now, you're trying it again. When Americans need jobs, the Republicans are pushing an anti-jobs bill. Here's what the NAM said about this program that you want to curtail: "The ATVM program is an example of what government-industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

So you listen to nobody except your empty rhetoric and, I think, dangerous action. If that wasn't enough, here's what the Chamber of Commerce said: "The ATVM program promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component of America's energy security."

□ 2210

So yesterday, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we sent him a letter citing his reference to the ATVM loan program as a "government subsidy for failing industries." GM failing? Chrysler failing? Ford failing? How misguided.

Well, now you're on your rampage to kill jobs and you've proposed to cut another program, section 1705, the loan program to help investments in new energy technology. This is a dangerous precedent. It's also, let's be frank, a dangerous smokescreen so some Republicans can change their votes. That's what this is all about.

Well, you don't want to listen to Warren Buffett on taxes, and now you're thumbing your vote at Bill Gates. They issued a report yesterday—Bill Gates and a number of other technology leaders—and I quote from the report about energy programs like what you're trying to cut:

"If the U.S. fails to invent new technologies and create new markets and new jobs that will drive the transformation and revitalization of the \$5 trillion global energy industry, we will have lost an opportunity to lead in what is arguably the largest and most pervasive technology sector in the world. However, if the U.S. successfully innovates in clean energy, our country stands to reap enormous benefits."

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. It goes on:

"Unfortunately, the country has yet to embark on a clean energy innovation program commensurate with the scale of national priorities that are at stake. In fact"—and I interpolate here this is what you're doing—"rather than improve the country's energy innova-

tion program and invest in strategic national interests, the current political environment is creating strong pressure to pull back from such efforts."

That's exactly what you're doing today. This bill is dangerous mindlessness.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply remind my colleagues why it is that we're here.

We're faced with the prospect of a government shutdown. There was a grand total as of this morning of \$212 million in the fund to deal with our fellow Americans who are suffering because of disasters that we've gone through over the past several weeks and months, and we want to make sure that the appropriations process, which has been dumped on us, is able to be addressed in a bipartisan way. I want Democrats and Republicans alike to come together to address this.

The \$100 million additional offset, the only minor modification that has been made, is to ensure that we don't have—and I know Democrats and Republicans alike agree on this—we don't want to have another Solyndra. And that's what we believe we can do.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Tomorrow will be yet another Friday without a paycheck for too many Americans. For many Americans, this may be the week that their unemployment benefits finally run out and they have no income left whatsoever. For many Americans, this might be the last weekend they spend in their home because the eviction notice or the foreclosure process comes due next week. There has been a natural disaster this summer in America, but there has been an economic disaster in America for a very long time.

Fifteen days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and in good faith laid out a plan to put Americans back to work. In those 15 days, this majority has had no hearings, no discussions, and no votes on the President's plan to put the country back to work. Until today, it was accurate to say they had done nothing about the job situation in America. Today, they've done something. They put forward a bill that destroys a program that has created 39,000 jobs in the private sector.

My friend from California talked about the new deal that GM may strike to build the new generation of cars in China. With all due respect, that's the point. The purpose of this program is to make sure that the next generation of cars is built by Americans and sold to Chinese, not built by Chinese and

sold to Americans. So if we let this bill pass, we are waving the white flag of surrender on the next generation of vehicles.

Now, they say, well, we have to do this because we have to provide disaster relief. I think there is unanimity in this Chamber that the victims of floods and hurricanes and other crises deserve help, but the artificial excuse that's being used here is, well, we have to pay for the help.

I have a suggestion. We're going to spend in the next 10 days in Iraq and Afghanistan what it would cost to deal with this disaster relief. How about that? Instead of crushing American jobs here at home, why don't we do the intelligent thing and say to the Iraqis and the Afghans, it's time they ran their own country with their own money. How about that for an offset? We should never have to choose between employing our neighbors and ignoring our needs.

The right vote here is "no." Let's bring back to the floor tomorrow a plan that both sides can support that keeps Americans working, puts Americans back to work, and solves this disaster problem. Vote "no," and then let's fix the problem.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to simply say that job creation and economic growth is what we are all about. The deal about which my friend just referred to is one which is part of the global marketplace. The goal of having U.S. manufacturers, U.S. workers manufacturing automobiles for sale in China and vice versa is our priority.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding and I appreciate the time because, as we talk about the President's jobs bill, I was here, too, when the President came to present his ideas, and it kind of excited me. Because, as I looked at where the President began on some of these jobs issues and I looked at what has been proposed in this House already on these jobs issues, I realized exactly how much progress we were able to make.

I think about the President's proposal to eliminate oil company subsidies, a proposal that I support. In fact, I have a bill that not just eliminates oil company subsidies, but all industrial subsidies so that we can let the free market drive that train and create those jobs anew.

I think about the President's proposal to curtail the payroll tax and I think, we already have a proposal that not only curtails the payroll tax to the small degree the President recommends, but actually, since it's the largest tax that 80 percent of American taxpayers pay, eliminate it entirely.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'm limited to only 2 minutes. If my friend from New York would like to yield me time, I would be happy to yield that back.

But I just want to say, as my friend from the Ways and Means Committee knows, not only do we have that proposal introduced here—it's H.R. 25, the Fair Tax. We've had hearings on it in the Ways and Means Committee. So I say to my friend from New Jersey, we are moving forward on those agendas.

But let me just talk about why we're here tonight.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. If I could get some time from my friend from New York, I would love to yield to agree with you. I wanted to tell you how much I believe we're headed on the same track.

But let me talk about this continuing resolution because that's really why we're here, despite the fact that folks bring up where we are in the President's jobs bill. This is about getting disaster relief to families that need it. And we could have gotten it done yesterday—and should have gotten it done yesterday. And even though I'm new at this process, I actually thought we had an agreement to get it done yesterday. I thought we had an agreement because it was the right thing to do to get it done yesterday. Now, only folks who are more privy than I know why that agreement came unglued and why it was we didn't get it done, but we're back here tonight and we have that opportunity. Please, please, let's get it done for those folks who need it. The time for games has long since passed.

□ 2220

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Before I yield to my friend from New Jersey, let me respond to my friend from Georgia. Don't forget that 48 on your side voted against it. I don't know what agreement you had with them.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I did want to ask my friend from Georgia a question, Mr. Speaker, if I might. He says he's on the right track.

Will the gentleman agree that we should have an up/down vote on the President's jobs plan on this floor?

Mr. WOODALL. I actually don't like those kind of long, complicated bills, I would say to my friend. But should we vote on his ideas, one idea at a time—I say that regularly. Had we voted on the President's health care bill one idea at a time, America would have loved 80 percent of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, is that a yes or a no?

Mr. WOODALL. That's a let's vote on it one idea at a time, not just his ideas, but all of our ideas.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the gentleman vote for the President's tax cuts for small businesses that create jobs if they hire someone?

Mr. WOODALL. The tax proposal I'm familiar with is his \$1.5 trillion tax increase. Is there a different—

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the President's plan was a small busi-

ness that creates jobs will get a tax cut.

Will you vote for that?

Mr. WOODALL. If he wants to reduce the highest corporate tax rate in the world, I am a huge supporter of that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, is that a yes or a no on that idea?

Mr. WOODALL. I will vote for any reduction in corporate rates that the President proposes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, does the gentleman favor the provision that says we should put teachers who have been laid off back in the classroom?

Mr. WOODALL. I absolutely do, and with State and local funds we're doing that today. I hope we'll continue to do that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, would the gentleman agree, though, we should use some Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. WOODALL. I do not believe the Federal Government should be involved in education.

Mr. ANDREWS. I disagree.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close on our side. If my friend is prepared to close, then we can close the debate here and move to a vote on the rule, and then move directly to consideration of the appropriations bill, so that the American people will be closer to getting resources they desperately need.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am expecting another speaker who is not yet on the floor.

My speaker has arrived, Mr. CROWLEY of New York, and I will yield him 3 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I'm not opposed to keeping our government up and running. In fact, I want desperately to support a bill as simple as keeping the Federal Government up and running.

What I'm imposed to is, I believe, ugly, out-right partisan politics, especially at a time when Americans want to work constructively together to address the serious problems that we're all facing. But bipartisanship is not at work here tonight, and it has not been here for some time.

Since President Obama announced the American Jobs Act, my colleagues on the other side have held zero hearings, not a single hearing on that plan.

Since Solyndra announced it was going out of business, the majority has held three hearings, and there are more scheduled to come. Let's be clear. We should get all the answers, every answer about Solyndra's failings. But I'm sorry. That is not a comprehensive agenda that will produce one single job.

Time is ticking because, while we stand here tonight quibbling about how to pay for the day-to-day functions of government, and how best to assist American communities hurting after hurricanes, flooding, droughts, and

wildfires, Europe and China are working overtime to outcompete us on every front.

President Obama and the Democratic Party have a plan for keeping the U.S. competitive on the global stage. We have a plan for keeping American businesses, workers, and industries stronger and better than our foreign competitors.

It's Democrats who got engaged and saved GM and Chrysler. It's Democrats who created the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, a program that has created almost 40,000 auto manufacturing jobs in less than 2 years. And it's Democrats who have led the way on green energy.

By contrast, the GOP agenda can be summed up in one word: "roadblock." Not road building, roadblock.

Republicans aren't focused on producing jobs. They oppose trying to put Detroit back on its feet. They are opposed to bringing President Obama's bills to the floor. And in the very bill we are debating right now, they are making cuts to the very manufacturing program I just cited as a job creator.

My colleagues, there are Americans across the country who are hurting. They've lost jobs, been foreclosed upon, and have endured extreme natural disasters of all kinds. They cannot accept a Congress that isn't willing to put them first. They cannot accept a Congress that insists upon offsets for aid to rebuild America, but not for aid to rebuild schools, hospitals, and roads in Iraq and Afghanistan. They cannot accept a Congress that holds more hearings on the failure of one company, but not one hearing on a job plan for America. I'm sorry, but this is not acceptable.

Vote "no" on this bill and reject the GOP's roadblock agenda.

Mr. DREIER. I am prepared to close the debate on our side.

I reserve the balance of my time for that purpose.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, for granting me this time to say, at first, I really didn't believe it when someone suggested to me that the Republican Party would really like to defeat President Obama by raising the unemployment rate. I thought, that's too cynical to really believe.

But in this particular proposal tonight, what we see is a proposal by the Republican Party to take money from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program to help America compete in the auto industry with state-managed economies like China's and Japan's, and take it away from recovering auto firms and unemployed auto workers to give to disaster victims around this country.

It's a no-win game. We're hurting the American people. We take from one sector that is suffering for another sector that is suffering? In the greatest

automotive manufacturing country in the world, we don't want to put more people back to work because we want to defeat the President next year?

I'm starting to believe those that suggested this cynical ploy. Why should we hurt the automotive industry that is just beginning to hire back and starting to lift this economy in the industrial Midwest and through hiring at parts suppliers coast to coast?

Vote "no" on this cynical ploy to set disaster victims against unemployed auto workers in the automotive industry of this country, which has a right to compete. If you want to offset \$1.5 billion in costs of disaster assistance, take it from the bonuses Wall Street titans keep pocketing. For them, it's only pocket change.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, our Democrat leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I commend her for her enormous leadership, patience, and great intellect that she brings to bear on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate, it's really almost hard to explain to someone why we're coming back tonight with the same old, same old warmed-over stew that was rejected yesterday by the Congress of the United States. But since then we've had some support expressed for the initiative that is contained in this bill and against the notion that our Republican colleagues have that it's a good idea to use this as a pay-for.

I take particular pride in this provision that the Republicans are trying to zero out in this bill, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program.

You will recall, Mr. DREIER, that it was part of a bill that was passed when President Bush was President. It was the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. It was a bill that passed the Congress with strong bipartisan support, including your support, Mr. DREIER. In fact, 95 Republicans voted for the bill. It was an even split in the Republican Caucus, 95 for, 96 against. But you recall voting for that.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. No, I'm sorry, because you have a half an hour and I don't.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I've been mentioned three times, and since the gentlewoman has mentioned me—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California controls the time.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman has all the time. For some reason the Republicans are not showing their faces on the floor on this amendment. He has plenty of time on this bill, plenty of time to speak. If he didn't, I'd be more than happy to yield to him, but since he has so much time on his own, he can use that.

In any event, here's the thing. We have an initiative that is bipartisan.

We have an initiative that has passed the House in overwhelming numbers, 314-100; 314-100 it passed the House after coming back from the Senate.

Yesterday, there was an attempt made to use the funds allocated to the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program to offset the disaster assistance. I myself believe it is a matter of principle that we should just do with disaster assistance what we always have done, have no doubt in anyone's mind that when a disaster, a natural disaster strikes, the Federal Government will be there, FEMA will be funded, and that we don't have to look around for a place to say, let's prioritize. No, the disaster assistance is our priority.

□ 2230

But on top of that, they use as a pay-for, again, zeroing out the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing. I don't want you to take my words for the merit of this initiative. I want to quote for the record the letter from the United States of America Chamber of Commerce and the letter from the National Association of Manufacturers.

First from the Chamber of Commerce:

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

Then they go on to say that this is funded by the Department of Education, and that it's not the fault of industry if these funds have not been used.

In the NAM letter, National Association of Manufacturers, they say similarly:

"We express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program, authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush."

It was a very proud day for us when President Bush signed this bill. It made tremendous advances in energy efficiency and conservation. It was a great accomplishment of the Bush administration and a Democratic Congress working together, but the bill passed in strong bipartisan fashion.

"The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sec-

tor jobs and put our Nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

I will submit the rest of the letters for the RECORD so Members can read further for themselves in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and for all who view the work of Congress, they can see the importance of these initiatives, first by the strong bipartisan support that they received in a Democratically controlled Congress but signed by a Republican President, President Bush, a very major accomplishment, I think he believes.

The second point, though, is that, again, American people are looking for ways for us to create jobs. The Republicans have been in power in this Congress in this House of Representatives for over 250 days. They have not passed one bill into law which is a job creator; and today, they come back to the floor a second day in a row with a job destroyer. The repetition of it is almost frivolous when you think that what we could be talking about here is a clean CR, a clean continuing resolution that will meet our needs to November 18.

I thank Chairman DICKS for his leadership on this important issue, Mr. LEVIN, certainly Mr. DINGELL, who was a champion of this initiative from day one and a leader in the fight to preserve it here.

It could just have been so simple. Let's just keep government open until November 18 with a clean continuing resolution instead of coming to the floor and for the first time.

Now my colleagues will say, Well, we've had other emergencies that were funded. I'm not talking about emergencies. There are many emergencies. I'm talking about disasters. I'm talking about natural disasters when people's homes are swept away. This isn't political. This is very, very personal, if you've lost your home, your belongings, your livelihood, your business, your sense of community, the character of the area in which you live, as many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done. When you see the nature of the natural disasters, whether it's out-of-control forest fires in Texas, what happened in Joplin, Missouri, which is almost biblical in its proportion, and what happened on the east coast with the earthquake followed by hurricane followed by tornado followed by floods and all that goes with it.

Do you think people think that we have any relevance to their lives if we're talking about something like this when all they are saying is, Help. It's as if a building is on fire and you're going to figure out who is going to pay for the water instead of just running to the rescue.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this and urge my Republican colleagues to please pull this back, bring a clean CR to the floor. Let's get serious about the people's business.

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

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

As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) loan program. First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes. Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that is critical to the nation's recovery. Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry; numerous loan applicants have been in the queue for years, waiting for the Administration to complete its due diligence.

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

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
September 22, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

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

Introducing any new model motor vehicle is a capital intensive process. Automobile manufacturers and suppliers must make large investments at the front end before a

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

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

Sincerely,

PAUL A. YOST.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I'll be happy to yield to my distinguished California colleague at any moment as I make a couple of remarks here as she walks off the floor.

I asked her to yield, Mr. Speaker, because she three times referenced me as it relates to the vehicle program, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturers program. Let me just explain what we're faced with today, Mr. Speaker.

What we're faced with is the challenge of ensuring that we get the resources necessary to the American people who are suffering because of these disasters. Now, when my California colleague was Speaker of the House, we had disasters that took place like Hurricane Katrina. Much of that was offset. And so to act as if this is unprecedented is not a correct characterization of what has happened, because we have seen offsets for disasters in the past on numerous occasions over the last decade in excess of \$59 billion in offsets that provided for supplemental appropriations that have been out there.

As it relates to the Advanced Technology Vehicle program, I was going to say to my California colleague who is no longer on the floor, and I'd like to yield to her if she would like to come back to respond to this, there is a total of \$4 billion that is there. What we're doing is utilizing \$1.5 billion. So as people say that this program is being completely eliminated, that is not a correct characterization of what has happened.

Let me tell you what it is we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

We're doing everything that we can to find every dollar that we possibly can to ensure that our fellow Americans who are suffering due to these disasters are able to have the resources that are necessary. Of the \$1.5 billion which is utilized in the offset, it's been sitting in the coffers for 3 years. So to act as if we somehow are going to see some great loss of jobs is again a mischaracterization of what is happening.

We're establishing priorities. We have a priority, that being dealing with our fellow Americans in Joplin, Missouri, who suffered from that horrible tornado that hit that area. That's my home State of Missouri. I know how devastating. In listening to our colleague, Mr. LONG, it's very clear to see in his eyes the kind of effort that he's put in to deal with the rebuilding there. That is a priority.

Dealing with the photographs that we saw from Mr. WELCH's district who voted for this bill yesterday and I suspect will vote for it again this evening to ensure that those who suffered from flooding in Vermont have that. And as I said earlier in the day, our new colleague, TOM MARINO from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, who just in the past several days was trudging through the mud as he reported to my colleagues in our meeting downstairs talking to the parents of children who were literally sitting on the hoods of their automobiles because their homes had been devastated. And the question asked by that parent to Congressman MARINO was, What is it you are going to do? And he said that he was going to come to Washington and do everything that he possibly can, everything that he would be able to do to ensure that they have the resources they need.

Now, to argue that this is pitting a fund that has been sitting dormant for 3 years and is not in the pipeline versus utilization of those resources for the American people who are suffering is a very inappropriate thing to do.

So that was the discussion that I was looking forward to having with my California colleague as she talked about my support of the Advanced Technology Vehicle program.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I'm always happy to yield to my good friend from Detroit.

□ 2240

Mr. LEVIN. Look, no one is saying the total program would be obliterated.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just said no one is saying that. I'm sure that my friend was not here through the entire debate.

Mr. LEVIN. I was.

Mr. DREIER. I don't know that my friend was listening through the entire debate.

Mr. LEVIN. I was.

Mr. DREIER. May I finish, Mr. Speaker?

What I want to say is that we were told that we on our side of the aisle are declaring war—declaring war—by the statement made by our friends from Massachusetts, and from that, one would have to infer that we were trying to obliterate a program.

When we, Mr. Speaker, have 3 years of those dollars sitting dormant, not being expended and not in the pipeline, we believe that we can utilize those dollars for the American people who

are truly in need. We need to move ahead with that as expeditiously as possible, and I think we should try to do that right now and get to the appropriations bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentlelady from New York yield me 30 seconds?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm sorry, Mr. LEVIN. I don't have any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time is there on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman from California yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 1 minute, and I will yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. No one has said that the program will be eliminated. What we have said is what the Manufacturers Association has said. It believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We've had this read to us three times.

Mr. LEVIN. You don't want to hear the facts.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I've heard it three times read on the House floor. We heard the debate earlier today. It was read by our colleagues, Mr. Speaker. I've heard this three times on the House floor.

What I want to say is that we've had, for 3 years, the dollars that we're utilizing for the offset sitting dormant.

Mr. LEVIN. It is not true.

Mr. DREIER. It is true, and it is not in the pipeline to be expended, Mr. Speaker. So, for that reason, I believe the people of Joplin, Missouri, can better utilize dollars that have been sitting for 3 years for absolutely no purpose whatsoever.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question at the end of the debate, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that disaster victims get the help that they need. My amendment will allow Representative DINGELL to offer a motion to strike the unacceptable House language and to substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Here we are again.

Yesterday, the House rebuked the Republicans because they came forward with almost as bad a bill as this. They were going to destroy, as they are tonight, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. It's one of the most successful programs we've had. It has made 40,000 jobs for Ameri-

cans. At a time when Americans are losing their homes, losing their jobs, running out of unemployment compensation, they want to hear us say what we're doing about jobs, what we're doing about opportunity, what we're doing about making the economy grow.

So the Republicans, when they got their heads handed to them yesterday, went back to caucus and made the bill a little bit worse so that they could appeal to their right-wing extremes. The result is that you've got a bill here that has been brought to us that nobody has had an opportunity to see and a bill on which we haven't got any idea exactly what it does.

We hear our good friend from California tell us how the private system of government is working. He says it's working in China because the Chinese have forced GM to work with them to manufacture cars over there so that they can sell them over here. We say that we ought to be manufacturing those cars over here with American workers to sell over there in China and in other countries that are playing the same game with us.

This is an enormously successful program. They're submitting their successes of yesterday by trying now to cut other programs which do this.

They talk about Solyndra. Solyndra went broke for a very simple reason. I sat in on the hearings when I don't think many of the other Members on this side did. I heard that the reason they went under was the trade practices of the Chinese. That's why. They're underselling them in an intolerable way in spite of the fact that we've tried to bring that technology over here and to make it work for the American people in order to provide jobs for the American people.

My Republican colleagues are making a war between the American workers and American industry on the one side and those who have need of relief from the disasters. That's not good. It should not be. It is quite sufficient that we help both. There is no need to have an offset for a disaster, and time after time we have not done it. But not so the Republicans. They are out to kill Department of Energy loan programs. These are programs that create jobs.

Take a look in your district, if they'll give you a copy of this bill, and ask yourself and ask them and ask of the legislation: What are they cutting that is in your district or your State that's going to make jobs and opportunity for your people? You're going to find, when this legislation passes—God forbid it will do so—that you have cut the opportunities and the well-being of your American people who desperately look to us to make the economy go again. You are burning here tonight the seed corn of the American people. You are taking and striking a major blow against the economy and the well-being of this Nation. I say, Shame.

Reject the rule.

Reject the previous question.

Reject the proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 30 seconds remaining.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to simply say to my colleagues that we're here for a very important reason. The reason is that we want to make sure that we don't face a government shutdown. We want to make sure that we do everything we possibly can so that the people in this country who have suffered from disasters over the past several weeks and months are able to have the resources that they need to do that, and we want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do it in a fiscally responsible way so that we can do what every American and every Democrat and Republican in this House says needs to be done so that we can get our economy growing and put into place pro-growth, job creation proposals. I believe that we can do that. I think we can do it responsibly.

I will say that this is the identical package that we had last night, with one modification; and that one modification is to ensure, with all due respect to my friend, the distinguished dean of this House, that we don't have another Solyndra. Regardless of what some have said was the cause of their demise, when we have employees of that company coming forward and making the case that they were spending money left and right, that they were using it on some of the most outrageous things imaginable, and that the employees could not understand why they built a factory when they had all of these resources in reserve, this cannot be allowed. It's not a responsible expenditure of U.S. taxpayer dollars, Mr. Speaker, and that's the reason we believe this \$100 million can be used for the people who are truly in need.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 412 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after expiration of debate on the motion to concur specified in the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend printed in section 3 of this resolution. That motion may be offered only by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, shall be

debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against that motion are waived.

SEC. 3. The motion to amend referred to in section 2 is as follows:

“(1) Strike sections 125 and 126 of the House amendment (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

“(2) At the end of the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

“SEC. ____ . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby enacted into law the provisions of division B of the amendment adopted by the Senate on September 15, 2011, to House Joint Resolution 66 (112th Congress), relating to emergency supplemental disaster relief appropriations.”.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled

“Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 177, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 725]

YEAS—235

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

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

NAYS—177

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

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann	Calvert	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Giffords
Butterfield	Deutch	Gohmert

Guinta Rangel Speier
Langevin Reichert Stark
Luján Schock Waxman
Paul Shuler Welch

□ 2312

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 176, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 726]

YEAS—238

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

Schmidt Stearns Walsh (LL)
Schock Stivers Webster
Schweikert Stutzman West
Scott (SC) Sullivan Westmoreland
Scott, Austin Terry Whitfield
Sensenbrenner Thompson (PA) Wilson (SC)
Sessions Thornberry Wittman
Shimkus Tiberi Wolf
Shuster Tipton Womack
Simpson Turner (NY) Woodall
Smith (NE) Turner (OH) Yoder
Smith (NJ) Upton Young (AK)
Smith (TX) Walberg Young (FL)
Southernland Walden Young (IN)

NAYS—176

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Giffords	Shuler
Bilbray	Hirono	Speier
Bishop (GA)	Luján	Stark
Butterfield	Olver	Waxman
Carson (IN)	Paul	Welch
Deutch	Rangel	
Garamendi	Reichert	

□ 2319

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 726, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2608.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration”, approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking “July 31, 2011” each place it appears and inserting “July 31, 2012”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) *GENERAL PROVISIONS.*—

(1) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) *RULE.*—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) *APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.*—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled “An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration”, approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) *DEFICIT REDUCTION.*—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) *POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.*—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(A) The Administration” and inserting “The Administration”; and

(2) by striking “research and development” and all that follows and inserting “research and development.”.

(c) **SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.**—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) **DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) **CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.**—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) **PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.**—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) **PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.**—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) **NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) **CORPORATION.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) **LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.**—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) **ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.**—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) **SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.**—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.**—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.”.

(2) **TITLE 10.**—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation”.

(3) **TITLE 38.**—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “any of the” and all that follows and inserting “any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).”.

(4) **VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.**—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking “In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop” and inserting “Develop”.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as “Emerging Leaders” in the document of the Small Business Administration titled “FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual Performance Report” (or any predecessor or successor document).

MOTION TO CONCUR

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 with an amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, that were conducted in fiscal year 2011, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2011 (division A of Public Law 112–10).

(2) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (division B of Public Law 112–10).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 1.503 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2011 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2011 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this Act; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 18, 2011.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this Act may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2012 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2011 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount incorporated by reference in

this Act that was previously designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress. Section 101(b) of this Act shall not apply to any amount so designated.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts for “Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and Expenses”.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this Act, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2012 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts made available by this Act for “Department of Defense—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” may be used by the Secretary of Defense for operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That the authority made by this section shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act: Provided further, That section 9014 of division A of Public Law 112–10 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding section 101, funds made available in title IX of division A of Public Law 112–10 for “Overseas Contingency Operations” shall be available at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate permitted by H.R. 2219 (112th Congress) as passed by the House of Representatives on July 8, 2011.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by section 127b of title 10, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 119. The authority provided by section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2412), as extended by section 1204(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4623), shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$29,130,000.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2434 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Act of 2011 (D.C. Act 19–92), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the necessary expenses of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, to carry out its functions under title XV of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), at a rate for operations of \$28,350,000.

SEC. 123. (a) Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

(b) Notwithstanding section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)), the Small Business Technology Transfer Program shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)), the pilot program under section 9(y) of such Act shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 124. Section 8909a(d)(3)(A)(v) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2011” and inserting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 129 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2009 (division A of Public Law 110–329), \$500,000,000 is rescinded, \$774,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief”, and \$226,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with “Corps of Engineers—Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies”: Provided, That the amounts made available by this section for the Corps of Engineers—Civil shall be for emergency expenses for repair of damage caused by the storm and flood events occurring in 2011: Provided further, That the amounts transferred by this section shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each amount transferred by this section is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 126. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief” at a rate for operations of \$2,650,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a full accounting of disaster relief funding requirements for such account for fiscal year 2012 not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and for fiscal year 2013 in conjunction with the submission of the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2013.

(b) The accounting described in subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall include estimates of the following amounts:

(1) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that has been (or will be) carried over to such fiscal year from prior fiscal years.

(2) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that will be carried over from such fiscal year to the subsequent fiscal year.

(3) The amount of the rolling average of non-catastrophic disasters, and the specific data used to calculate such rolling average, for such fiscal year.

(4) The amount that will be obligated each month for catastrophic events, delineated by event and State, and the total remaining funding that will be required after such fiscal year for each such catastrophic event for each State.

(5) The amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered each month of such fiscal year.

(6) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for emergencies, as defined in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)).

(7) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for major disasters, as defined in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

(8) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for fire management assistance grants, as defined in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187).

SEC. 127. Any funds made available pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to sustain essential security activities, such as: staffing levels of operational personnel; immigration enforcement and removal functions, including sustaining not less than necessary detention bed capacity; and United States Secret Service protective activities, including protective activities necessary to secure National Special Security Events. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 130. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “October 4, 2011”.

SEC. 131. Sections 1309(a) and 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a) and 4026) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 132. Section 330 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (42 U.S.C. 1701 note), concerning Service First authorities, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 133. Notwithstanding section 101, section 1807 of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting “\$374,743,000” for “\$363,843,000” and “\$10,900,000” for “\$3,000,000”.

SEC. 134. The second proviso of section 1801(a)(3) of Public Law 112–10 is amended by striking “appropriation under this subparagraph” and inserting “appropriations made available by this Act”.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$14,510,000.

SEC. 136. Sections 399AA(e), 399BB(g), and 399CC(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i(e), 280i–1(g), 280i–2(f)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 137. Notwithstanding section 101, section 2005 of division B of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting “\$0” for each dollar amount.

SEC. 138. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011” in section 7 of such Act of 1945.

SEC. 139. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2011”.

SEC. 140. Commitments to guarantee loans incurred under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715e–3 and 1735c), shall not exceed a rate for operations of \$25,000,000,000: Provided, That total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, may be apportioned through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act, at \$80,000,000 multiplied by the number of days covered in this Act.

SEC. 141. (a) RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BUREAU FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in

section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the *Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003*.

(2) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION*.—This section shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the *Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003*.

(b) *PAYGO COMPLIANCE*.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the *Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010*, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this section, submitted for printing in the *Congressional Record* by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE*.—This section shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

(d) *APPLICABILITY*.—This section shall not be subject to any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 142. Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available for “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Title 17—Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program” pursuant to title IV of division A of Public Law 111–5, \$100,000,000 is rescinded.

This Act may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring to the floor the continuing appropriations resolution to keep the Federal Government operating until November 18, 2011. Before you is a slightly amended version of the bill, which is necessary after last night’s vote. I hope that my colleagues recognize the urgency of this situation and will join me in taking the responsible step and support this CR.

This bill must pass if we’re going to keep our word to the American people. We need to get help to Americans who need it most, those who have lost their homes and their businesses to the unforgiving natural disasters that have beset us.

FEMA is rapidly burning through its emergency funding and its ability to help those people recover from the tornados, hurricanes, earthquakes, wildfires and other disasters.

Right now, at this minute, FEMA has \$200 million left in the coffer. They’re spending at the rate of \$30 million a day for disaster relief. And at this rate, of course, they will be out of money over the weekend.

This infusion of funding—\$1 billion in emergency fiscal year 2011 disaster funding and \$2.65 billion for fiscal 2012—is critical. I can’t stress that enough. And it will go far to relieve the burdens of those who are in need tonight.

This version of the bill creates an additional offset to the fiscal year 2011

emergency funding. In addition to the \$1.5 billion offset from the vehicle loan program, we are rescinding \$100 million from the Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program, a section of the failed Stimulus Act that funded the now-bankrupt company Solyndra.

The CR also continues government operations at a rate of \$1.043 trillion. That’s the amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in August as part of the debt ceiling compromise, and it is on the law books of the country. This reduced responsible rate will help restore our Nation’s fiscal health.

It is vital that Congress pass this legislation as swiftly as possible. We must prevent a government shutdown, and we have to replenish exhaustive disaster recovery funds which will dry up over the weekend. And just as importantly, we need time to complete work on the fiscal year 2012 appropriations legislation so we can avoid the uncertainty and instability that we saw last year when it took us until April to complete full-year appropriations legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, not only to keep the government running, but also to help the hundreds of thousands of Americans relying on us to get them back on their feet all across the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know as well as anyone that Members change their minds. I’ve heard a lot about that the last couple of days. But here we are debating essentially the same bill that we voted on yesterday. Many Republicans who voted “no” last night did so because they believed \$1.043 trillion is too much spending. The bill before us tonight spends \$1.043 trillion.

I will be the first to say every Member is entitled to change his or her mind; however, I am eager to hear my Republican colleagues who voted “no” yesterday answer why it is okay to vote “yes” today. And I hope these Members will not hang their hat on the one fig leaf of change in the bill. The bill now includes a rescission of \$100 million in emergency funding from section 1705 of the renewables DOE loan program. A rescission of emergency funds does not score as a reduction from the \$1.043 trillion.

Democrats voted “no” for two reasons: we strongly oppose taking funding from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. This is a program that has proven to be a success in creating new jobs, and such a success that the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States have both called upon the Congress to not cut out this program because, one, the money is repaid, and it is creating jobs—something the majority has not done in the months that they’ve been in the majority. This is a jobs program.

We strongly oppose the notion that efforts to help Americans rebuild their

lives after floods, hurricanes, wildfires and other natural disasters should be put on hold until Congress can agree on offsetting reductions in spending. We will continue to vote “no” because the bill continues to acquire an offset to provide disaster relief funding, and that offset is misguided. Republicans take \$1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program at the Department of Energy to pay for \$1 billion in disaster relief.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program was started in 2008 to reinvigorate American manufacturing. To date, the program has awarded \$3.5 billion of credit subsidy to promote energy-efficient advanced vehicles and their component parts. The Department of Energy estimates the loan guarantees have created or maintained 39,000 jobs in California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Some have suggested that this program has been slow to spend emergency funding provided in the FY 2000 CR. I say the loan process ought to be strenuous. One company originally applied under a different loan program in 2006 and received an ATVM loan in 2010. It required 4 years of due diligence and review to qualify for the loan. Republicans seem to be issuing an ultimatum to all loan programs: expedite the review process or see your funding transferred away. By the way, the company in question, Tesla, employed about 400 employees before receiving the loan. Today, they have 1,400 employees in the field of engineering research and development, design, manufacturing, assembly, maintenance, and service, sales and support.

The ATVM program has an additional 18 loan applications in progress that are projected to create 50,000–60,000 more jobs in California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio. One pending application would support investments at 11 plants in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The company employs over 56,000 workers, having added nearly 9,000 new workers since 2009. Some of these jobs will be at risk because of this offset.

This is not the time to put American manufacturing jobs at risk.

□ 2330

That is why the National Association of Manufacturers expressed their support for the ATVM program in a letter to the Senate dated September 22, noting, “The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.” And the Chamber of Commerce agrees with them.

Now, I think it’s time for us to stay with our position and vote “no” and get a clean CR. That’s what I asked the committee to do. We need a clean CR. We don’t need this offset.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the distinguished chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2608, to provide the continuing resolution for the initial weeks. And I want to be sure that we keep the government open. And by passing this bill, we will keep the government open.

This bill is needed to keep vital government services and programs operating past the end of the fiscal year on September 30. As the gentleman from Kentucky has stated, the Committee on Appropriations has made great progress in moving 11 of the 12 annual bills. However, additional time is needed for the consideration of the other.

This continuing resolution, for anyone who questions it, conforms to the spending reduction targets that were agreed to by the House, the Senate, and the White House. It's exactly the same number, and so no reason to vote against it. Specifically, the bill sets an annual rate that reduces overall discretionary spending by 1.5 percent from fiscal year 2011.

In addition, the bill provides disaster funding to provide much-needed assistance to individuals and communities suffering from hurricane and flood damage. The State of Virginia has been hit, as many others.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill. By voting for the bill, we will keep the government open.

The American people sometimes think this institution and this town is dysfunctional. We can ensure that we can do our work. Pass this bill.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee and former chair.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Just yesterday this continuing resolution failed because of widespread concerns with the plan to offset disaster relief funding from a key Department of Energy program. One day later we're having the exact same debate. The only thing that's changed is that the Republican majority has decided this time to target two Energy Department programs instead of one.

When the measure failed yesterday, House Republican leaders faced a basic decision. They could give up their efforts to hold disaster funding hostage to another partisan budget battle by removing the offset and passing the bill with a broad bipartisan majority.

Or they could make the measure even more extreme in order to cater to the most radical members of their party, without concern for the fact that FEMA is just days away from running out of money, and communities around the country are waiting desperately for the support that's been promised them.

Now, anybody who's been watching this Congress for the last 8 months should not be the least surprised by the majority's decision. Once again, Republicans have put partisan ideology ahead of the dire needs of the American people and are risking yet another destabilizing standoff over spending cuts in the process.

So now we're debating, under a martial-law rule, a bill that is even worse than it was yesterday. It still seeks to pay for urgent disaster relief needs by taking money from a major job-creating program at the Department of Energy.

As I said in this Chamber yesterday, this is a radical departure from the way we have treated emergency disaster relief in the past. Over the past 10 years, Congress has approved 16 supplementals that included emergency funding for FEMA disaster relief in response to disasters such as 9/11, Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Ike, and floods on the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers. None of these emergency appropriations for the disaster relief fund were paid for with cuts to other Federal programs.

Yesterday I heard several of my friends on the other side of the aisle claim that we've offset disaster assistance numerous times over the past decade. This is simply not accurate. Some of the supplemental bills that included disaster relief also included offsets, but these offsets were used to pay for entirely separate programs, never for FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund.

As I said yesterday, this insistence on offsets is bad precedent, and it's bad policy. It leaves disaster-affected communities in the lurch while undermining our economic recovery by cannibalizing an Energy Department program that stands to add tens of thousands of good-paying jobs in an industry critical to our future economic competitiveness.

And it goes even further than that by including a gratuitous and arbitrary rescission to another Department of Energy loan program, a change aimed at scoring political points against the President and winning Tea Party votes. But it has very little to do with balancing the budget or providing relief for those in need.

Moreover, rather than approving a bill that would win passage in the Senate, we are now sending over a measure that the Senate majority is on record opposing, causing more economic uncertainty, risking yet another manufactured crisis.

So, Mr. Speaker, I once again urge colleagues to oppose this measure, to support the Senate's approach to disaster relief instead, which would fully fund FEMA's needs without holding them hostage to another partisan budget battle.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I thank the distinguished chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this must-pass resolution. This CR not only keeps the government operating, but it provides a substantial infusion of desperately needed funding totaling \$3.65 billion for disaster relief and emergency flood control efforts.

That's funding to sustain disaster relief efforts in hard-hit States all across this Nation, including the devastation that hit my home State of Alabama back in April of this year. That's funding to address the record flooding up and down the Mississippi River and along the east coast resulting from Hurricane Irene. That's funding to help tens of thousands of people who have lost virtually everything but the shirts on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, the time for talk and the time for politicking is over. It's time to pass this vital resolution, provide our Nation with necessary disaster relief funding, avert a government shutdown, allow Congress to scrub the administration's full disaster supplemental request, provide the needed oversight, and complete the work on the FY 2012 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital resolution and responsibly address our Nation's most pressing needs.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member of the Energy and Water appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the measure.

During the debate on the rule on this measure, Joplin, Missouri was mentioned quite often. But I would mention that there is an emergency as far as Tuscaloosa, Alabama, is concerned; Hamburg, Iowa, is concerned; Cairo, Illinois, is concerned; Springfield, Massachusetts, certainly; Joplin, Missouri; Smithville, Mississippi; Williston, North Dakota; States like Vermont.

Subsequent to the rains and floods of this spring, we've had earthquakes, we've had wildfires, we had hurricanes.

The current need of the Army Corps is about \$2.257 billion, so the first observation I would make is the offsets that are set aside in this bill are certainly inadequate to cover that amount.

But there is a further emergency in this country, and that is the fact that, as of August of this year, there were 13,967,000 Americans who were without work. In the year 2000, 8 percent of the people who live in the great State of Indiana were living in poverty. Today, 16 percent of the people in the State of Indiana are living in poverty, and for those we represent who are working today, for 1 hour's worth of their labor, they're making 53 cents less today in real purchasing power than they did in 1977.

□ 2340

Today, there are 6,643,000 less Americans working in manufacturing making a living wage than there were in 1977.

So the response is let's take \$1.5 billion out of an investment account where there are still 10 pending applications to try to make cars in this country more efficiently, more fuel efficient, and more desirable for consumers.

But earlier tonight we heard, Don't worry; the Chinese are going to help our car companies with financing. I'm affronted by that possibility. That's why we need this \$1.5 billion so maybe we could still make cars in the United States of America without the help of the Chinese Government.

I think this is a wrongheaded approach.

And then let's pile on. There's obviously a controversy about a solar company in California. I think perhaps it is a matter to be considered not only by oversight in the United States Congress but the Justice Department. But that's not a decision for us to make if wrongdoing has occurred. But you know what? Let's take it out on somebody else. Let's make sure there is not money available for other legitimate companies who are trying to increase jobs in this country and who are trying to reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

That wasn't the response I saw in this body in 2008. We had the major financial institutions in this country drive our economy into the ground. Did we ask them to give back their tax advantages? Did we punish them in any way? We gave them money. We should at least pick on somebody our own size.

We didn't ask anybody in Iraq or Afghanistan whether or not they needed an offset for emergency money for schools, for hospitals, for bridges. The people in Joplin, the people in Vermont, the people in these other communities, they need our help now. Traditionally, we have recognized the emergency, we have declared the emergency, and we have helped them out.

And when Bill Clinton was President of the United States, we declared emergencies like this on three occasions in 1998, 1999, and 2001, and we balanced the budget.

I oppose this measure.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield 3 minutes to a brand new Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. My father taught me a long time ago not to make a speech or give an opinion unless I thought it was important. I think tonight it's important, and I hope that you also think it's important.

I would never question anyone's motives and ideals. However, we are here tonight to meet the immediate needs of the people that we represent.

This vote is not about politics. This vote is not about Republicans or Democrats. This vote is not about cut or not cut. This vote is about coming to the aid of the American people whom we

represent, the people who have been devastated by floods. People like friends and neighbors, seniors and children in the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and on the east coast. It is heartbreaking and it is heart wrenching. You must see it firsthand to understand it.

The Federal Government's main purpose is to protect its citizens from disaster, both from terrorism and from natural disasters.

My staff and I stood in mud, waste, and stagnant water over the last 3 weeks along with families who lost everything: furniture, clothes, photos, toys stacked outside of their homes that were destroyed or condemned. If each of you stood where I stood, I know in my heart that because you are compassionate, this bill would have been passed by now.

I tried to comfort children who were sitting in cars or on car rooftops and in truck beds because they could not get into their home that was condemned and filled with the same stagnant mud and water and waste and snakes that were outside their homes. I talked to grown men that were crying because their homes were destroyed and asked me, Where am I going to safely put my family tonight?

A little girl not more than 8 years old asked me where she was going to sleep because she no longer had her bed and her bedroom in which she and her sister slept.

Seniors were trapped on the second floor of their home because the first floor was flooded. Small businesses were completely wiped out.

I plead with you, I implore you, I beg you to pass this flood relief now for our people who do not have the basic comforts that those of us here have. The American people are depending on us to give them a hand up, and they deserve our immediate attention.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee, Mr. FATTAH of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. If we could have a vote to provide disaster relief, every Member in this Chamber would cast a vote in the affirmative. What we're asked to make tonight is a Solomon-like choice between tens of thousands of jobs for Americans who desperately need them and a limited amount of disaster relief. That is not a fair choice.

And I guess the majority wasn't happy with the polling that showed that only 12 percent of the public thought that Congress was doing a good job or 13 percent. We dropped to 12. I guess we're trying to get into the single digits.

What we need to do is to do our work. Now, this is a program where Ford Motor Company borrowed a loan guarantee at 5.9 to put people to work, some 30,000 people to work in Michigan and Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio. This is a program that's working, that taxpayers' money is paid back through these loan guarantees.

The National Association of Manufacturers in today's National Journal says that we now, as we have, lead the world in manufacturing with 21 percent of globally manufactured products. But China is now in second place at 15 and Japan has dropped to third at 12. Why would we want to concede our leadership in this world in manufacturing?

In the Republican decade under the Bush White House we lost 350,000 manufacturing jobs. We saw tens of thousands of small manufacturers close down in our Nation. Now, this administration, people talk about the number in August, but let's look at the entire 20 months of the Obama recovery—2½ million jobs led by increases consistently in manufacturing.

I ask that we reject this CR. I hope that the majority would come to the House with an approach that would actually respond to the disasters that we face without asking us to put more Americans out of work.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. It is a responsible measure. It makes good on the promises we must keep to members of our military, to our veterans, and to Americans who rely upon the essential functions of the Federal Government.

It cares for the needs of millions of Americans who have suffered from the effects of dramatic natural disasters, including the folks in my State of Missouri who live in Joplin, who live along the Mississippi in my specific district, who live along the Missouri River in the northern part of our State.

□ 2350

These folks can't wait another day for help because people are playing politics with this bill. The House and the Appropriations Committee are dedicated to a responsible process, and this bill reflects the amount of time needed to complete that work.

I think we've realized this year on both sides of the aisle that we have to bring the size and the spending of the Federal Government into line with reality. In the hearings and markups that we've conducted in the House and in the negotiations to make specific and significant spending cuts, not only this year but also in each of the next 10, and through the budget process, we have laid the groundwork for a new era of stewardship for our taxpayer dollars.

In addition to our covenant with members of the military, with veterans, with the families depending on a helping hand up, and for Americans who are really suffering from true emergencies that have devastated their homes, like Mr. MARINO said—their jobs and their lives—we do have a responsibility to the American taxpayer and to future generations who cringe

at the sight of our debt and our deficits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows us to work in good faith, to make good on both our promises and our responsibilities. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to, once again, put politics aside and support it here tonight.

Mr. DICKS. Would the Speaker tell us how much time both sides have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 14½ minutes left, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 18 minutes left.

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

Today was a very dramatic day on the stock market. The Dow Jones dropped 500 points because investors are worried that we're headed into a second recession; and what we get from the majority party is to cut out a program that creates jobs. The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program has already created 39,000 jobs. It's going to create another 39,000 with the \$2.5 billion that remains, and the \$1.5 billion that we're taking out of there would create another 10,000 jobs. These are jobs. The only way we're going to get unemployment down is to put people back to work.

And here we are again. After saving all these other programs—cutting people out of work in the public sector—now we're going to cut out automobile jobs. Let me read to you what the National Association of Manufacturers has to say, which is not an organ of the Democratic Party:

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

"The NAM is writing to express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—this is the program that we're taking \$1.5 billion out of"—authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs and put our Nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees."

I mean, if you had to go out and find a business group in this country that has more credibility, I don't know what it would be. It's the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Chamber of Commerce, which is also not an organ of the Democratic

Party, says: "As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program.

"First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes.

"Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that is critical to the Nation's recovery.

"Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry. Numerous loan applications have been in the queue for years, waiting for the administration to complete its due diligence."

That line started in the previous administration. So this is a jobs program.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we want to take care of those people who have suffered disasters. We want to take care of them. We will take care of them, but we also want to provide jobs for Americans who are unemployed. If I were in your shoes, I'd support jobs for workers and also take care of those people who are suffering because of a disaster.

Now, these are Republican-leaning organizations. They get it. Just vote "no," and let's get a clean bill and do the right thing for the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Interior appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I loved listening to the gentleman from Washington's debate. Now, if the gentleman wants to really create some jobs in this country, we can create hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs if we'll start getting oil going back in the gulf and permitted. The gentleman talked about not being so reliant on foreign oil. We've got rigs right now that were in the gulf that are off the coast of Africa because they can't get permitted in the gulf. Now, do you want to create millions of jobs? Join us on that, and let's create millions of jobs.

The gentleman talked about, geez, he just doesn't understand how people could change their votes. People actually sometimes learn more information and decide that they were wrong the time before and that now they'll change their votes, just like some people on that side of the aisle who actually issue press releases saying that they were going to support this CR and then change their minds. That's okay.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I didn't put out a press release, but I'll tell you one thing. I listen. I listen to the Chamber of Commerce and to the National Association of Manufacturers. I listen.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this continuing resolution. This CR is vital to keeping our government operating over the next 7 weeks while Congress completes its work on next year's budget.

It's worth reminding Members that tonight this CR actually reduces spending from last year's enacted levels and saves taxpayers billions of dollars. The irony is that voting against this CR is actually a vote for more spending. If you want to reduce government spending, then you should vote for this CR. It's pretty simple, really.

FEMA's coffers for disaster assistance are about to run dry. There is no such thing as a Republican natural disaster or a Democrat natural disaster. The last thing Congress should do is hold up disaster assistance because of partisan politics. We need to approve this CR tonight and get the relief to those in need as quickly as humanly possible.

Now, I've got to tell you, in all honesty, I'm not one of those people who believes that we have to offset every emergency. We have done some in the past—some we have not—but in the past, we have not had a \$14 trillion deficit. That's the danger to this country is the \$14 trillion deficit and the \$1.6 trillion we add to it every damned year.

I've got to admit, this is only \$1 billion. But do you know what? Some people say, Oh, that's only \$1 billion. I heard one Member say yesterday it was nickels and dimes. In Idaho, \$1 billion is not nickels and dimes. We did not get into this situation a trillion dollars at a time. We got here a million and a billion dollars at a time, and that's how we're going to get out of this situation. So let's do our job and do what's right for the country and get this deficit under control; and if we can offset it, let's offset it.

□ 0000

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members to refrain from using profanity in debate.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This is not a debate over compassion. This is not a debate over who cares more about the people in Joplin or the people in Vermont. This is a debate about what the Republicans, what the Tea Party has decided to use as an excuse, as a guise to finish off the revolution that the Democrats

have put in place that changes our relationship with where we get our energy from.

Big Oil and Big Coal have fought solar, wind, all-electric vehicles, biomass, geothermal, that entire revolution because they know that it will eat into their profits.

So a disaster occurs that each of us wants to respond to. The Republicans, responding to the oil and coal industry, say this is our chance to kill the revolution that makes it possible to have vehicles go 50, 60, 80, 100 miles a gallon without oil, no oil, that makes it possible for us to have wind and solar generate the electricity that will fuel those vehicles without sending greenhouse gases up into the atmosphere, which is changing our climate and leading to these storms, leading to these floods, leading to these disasters that then needs FEMA, need the relief that we give to these families. So they take the chance, they take the opportunity to kill the very programs which are the solution to these disasters which are being created here in our country and around the world, the agenda of Big Oil and Big Coal.

And the temerity of it all is that they know that the automotive program has already created 39,000 jobs in our country over the last 3 years and that this one cut that they are talking about tonight will kill 10,000 jobs over the next year. In the solar industry—and, by the way, they cut out \$100 million in solar and wind guarantees as well.

Right now, ladies and gentlemen, there are 85,000 jobs in the wind industry, almost all of them created in the last 4 years. There are 85,000 jobs in the coal industry. In other words, in the last 5 years, wind now equals the entire coal industry. There are 100,000 jobs in the solar industry, and last year we were a net exporter to China; 100,000 jobs in solar, 85,000 jobs in wind, and it is the future.

The oil industry laid off 20,000 employees over the last 3 years. Let us talk here about future, about young people, about this planet, about backing out the oil from OPEC so we can tell them we don't need their oil any more than we need their sand. That's what this debate is about tonight.

And under the guise, with these crocodile tears of how much they care about the victims, as though it's any greater on our side, they are using it as the guise to kill these programs. That's what it's all about tonight. That's why we're angry. That's what this is all about.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true that these alternative energy programs all create jobs?

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

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

Don't they all create jobs, these alternative energy programs? So instead of just having the automobile program that creates jobs cut by \$1.5 billion, now they are taking \$100 million out of another program that creates jobs for the American people, so this is a double header.

Mr. MARKEY. They could have taken this money out of the \$41 million of gas breaks for the oil and gas industry, but, no, they take it out of solar, they take it out of wind.

And by the way, wind and solar, with the same amount of money, creates five times more jobs than an investment in fossil fuels does. So they keep the money in for the programs that create three to five times less jobs than the program they are knee-capping here this evening. That's what this vote is all about.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is Solyndra part of the revolution that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MARKEY. Solyndra will receive no money under this program.

Who will receive this money? Indiana will receive the money.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

The program was started under the previous administration, the Bush administration. The last day they tried to force it out, to have it approved, and it was turned down by the good staff at the Department of Energy.

Mr. MARKEY. So they will not receive a nickel under this program. The oil and gas industry will receive that money as they tip the people of our country upside down and shake the money out of their pockets.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) a valued member of our committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, what the previous gentlemen did not say is that Solyndra received \$500 million because they have friends in high places. Despite even people in this administration who said don't do it, they received \$500 million. If that was in a different country, we wouldn't call it waste; we would call it corruption. But we won't do that here. The gentleman didn't say that.

He talks about the revolution. This cuts \$100 million from a program that gave because of influence, because of friends in high places, because of bundlers of campaign contribution funds to a corporation that went bankrupt and laid off a thousand people after receiving this money.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I would just point out that one of the largest investors was

Walmart, and Walmart has a long history of supporting Republican candidates. And I will just say, I will just say they invested, I think, \$3 or \$400 million. So there was a lot of private sector investment here, too.

I appreciate it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I reclaim my time.

Despite what the gentleman says, Mr. Speaker, the previous President's administration denied the funding for Solyndra because they knew it was a scam, regardless of anything else. This administration did that.

Now, the reason we have to support this CR—let's cut politics aside. Let's not talk about revolutions of money blown like stimulus money, that was blown. The reason this CR makes sense is because there are people who are suffering from natural disasters. This CR funds that program and it helps them out. And the reason this is important is because it controls the size and the cost of the Federal Government that is totally out of control.

So no more gimmicks, no more giveaways to friends of friends because of high pressure.

Let's pass this CR so we can keep the government rolling, so we can slow down the growth of government, and so we can help the victims without corruption of those who have friends in high places.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a valued member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this continuing resolution. It will fund the government through November 18. It takes care of many of our disaster needs.

As you heard from my colleague so eloquently, Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania, you heard about the plight of so many people in towns like Shickshinny and West Pittston who are living in the front yard in the cars. People are broken. Communities have been ruined, and so we need to pass this bill.

I urge you to support this bill.

□ 0010

I've heard a lot of talk tonight about manufacturing. My dad's family spent 100 years making industrial hardware in Pennsylvania. If you really care about manufacturing, some of you might have considered voting for a bill last week to allow the Nation's largest exporter to open up a billion-dollar facility in the State of South Carolina to hire a thousand people to make aircraft. If you really want to help manufacturing, you should've voted for that bill.

You can also help us in stopping EPA's assault on the coal industry and on the cement industry. I represent the largest cement-producing district in America. These industries are in trouble, and they're under assault by this EPA. Help us. There'll be measures considered here to deal with them.

If you are truly concerned about manufacturing, innovation and research, you wouldn't have slapped a 2.3 percent tax on medical devices. It's going to kill tens of thousands of jobs in this country. We make a lot of devices in my part of the world, in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. We need help. Our manufacturers need help.

So rather than defending a company out in California that just wasted \$500 million, down the drain, taxpayer dollars, 1,100 people out of work, let's do something to help manufacturers. And most importantly, let's pass this bill tonight to help so many people who are struggling throughout this country in Pennsylvania; New Jersey; New York; Vermont; the people of the South; Joplin, Missouri; and elsewhere who have been affected by these horrible natural disasters. Please, stand up, do the right thing and vote for this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a hardworking member of our committee and a newcomer to the Congress.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the time.

I know the hour is late. It's been a long time. Soon we will complete action on this temporary spending measure for 2012. Obviously, it is work that has to be done. As my friend, the distinguished Rules Committee chairman appropriately quoted earlier this evening: the process has been ugly. It has been messy; but it works.

The good news is that most of America has gone to bed and not witness to the bickering and rancor evidenced in this Chamber. I can only hope that when they wake up tomorrow, we will have done the people's work, funding government beyond October 1, giving necessary funding to the victims of natural disasters, and doing it such a way that promotes the kind of fiscal responsibility long demanded by the people of America.

It will be sad, indeed tragic, if when the sun comes up tomorrow, this Congress, instead of bringing certainty and relief to those struggling, as this CR does, we impose yet another threat of a government shutdown and more uncertainty into an already skeptical populace.

This legislation up until yesterday, Mr. Speaker, had bipartisan support. And only because my friends on the other side of the aisle recognized that many on our side preferred much deeper cuts and might be predisposed to opposing the CR, they pounced on it. And quickly, in an instant, that bipartisan support disappeared into the bowels of the business as usual. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it was politics ahead of the people.

Let's remember that this CR we'll vote on in the next few minutes was crafted based on the numbers outlined

in the BCA approved in this Chamber just a few weeks ago, complete with desperately need disaster funding, reasonably and responsibly offset.

I urge my colleagues to support the CR.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a member of the committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The question we're debating tonight is not whether we give aid and assistance to those of our neighbors that have been hit by serious disasters. We all agree that's the appropriate thing to do. The question is do we cut spending elsewhere to pay for that assistance.

Now, what our friends on the left have told us is, look, that's not the way we've done it in the past. In fact, we've always done it by just going ahead and spending without any offset. Doing it the way we've always done it has put us \$14 trillion in debt.

What we have to do is exactly what the people of Monroe County, Mississippi did on the night of April 26. Those families had dreams. They had hopes; they had plans. And on April 27, the tornados hit and their plans changed, and they redirected their spending plans to take care of the disaster. Now, if the families in Monroe County, Mississippi have done that, they have every reason to expect their government to do the same thing.

Now, we've been told, But we need some government program to create jobs. If we will give the American people the assurance that their government is serious about cutting spending like this bill does, we'll give them the confidence to create jobs. If we remove the regulatory burdens, American businesses will create jobs. And if we give them the assurance that we're not going to raise their taxes, the American economy will thrive and create jobs.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished whip of the Democratic Party, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of my goodest, best friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 4¾ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a legislative arena, not a coliseum to attack one another. It is a legislative arena to try to come together to do what the American public expects us to do.

There are at least two crises confronting the American people, and perhaps three. First of all, they are concerned about the fiscal posture of this country. They're right. We need to address that.

Secondly, they're concerned about jobs. And immediately, as the gentleman from Mississippi just pointed out, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke earlier, they are concerned about the disasters that have put them at risk. And I suggest to you the people in your district and in my district who don't have a job, who aren't sure how they are going to pay their mortgage and aren't sure that they are going to be able to buy food tomorrow believe that they too have been confronted with a disaster. They want us to deal with all three of those items and, yes, perhaps more.

Many of you have stood on this floor and said we need to act now to help these people who have been the victims of hurricane, of quake, of fire, of flood. Now, if you want to act now, what you bring to this floor is a bill that is not controversial so it does not get mired in this bickering back and forth, because we care deeply about responding now.

This bill has never enjoyed bipartisan support from my perspective, and I told your whip that on Tuesday. There was no surprise. We believe strongly that the provision that you have put in this bill is detrimental to working people and the expansion of our economy. You perhaps do not agree on that. Perhaps we have a legitimate item of disagreement. And so if you were really concerned about those flood victims, about those hurricane victims, you would have taken that out and met that issue another day. But you chose not to do that.

You chose to continue the partisan path of placing at risk the continued funding of government through November 18, which you have all expressed a desire to do, and jobs, not that Democrats say are advantaged by the provision you want to strike, but the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

□ 0020

They say it puts jobs at risk. Your folks in Pennsylvania, I tell my friend, will not be helped if this bill continues to be mired in partisan differences. And you knew there was a partisan difference, and notwithstanding that, you brought it back to this floor. Now I understand there are some of you that were concerned that this was \$1.043 trillion rather than \$1.019 trillion. That's been changed for you now. And I'm sure all your Tea Party friends are going to be very enthusiastic that for four-tenths of a percent you perhaps have changed your vote. My, my, my. Four-tenths of a percent. That's the difference in this bill from a fiscal perspective.

My friends, Americans need our help. They don't need Republican help or Democratic help; they need all of our help. They need it now. They need it not mired in partisan bickering, as my friend said from Arkansas. They need us to come together on that which we can agree, giving our folks help when

they need it—now. And I will tell you that the Senate determined that there was twice the need—indeed, three times the need—that you have determined.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's defeat this bill and let's bring tonight or tomorrow morning a bill that I guarantee you will pass overwhelmingly in this House.

Yesterday, we were hoping to vote—Democrats and Republicans together—on a bipartisan bill to fund the Government through November according to the budget deal we had agreed upon.

We did vote together, as it turns out, in bipartisan opposition, though for very different reasons.

Democrats opposed it because it was too extreme, endangering emergency funding to help our constituents hit by disasters and threatening to cut from a program that actually creates jobs.

Some Republicans voted against the CR because it wasn't extreme enough.

Now, we have been waiting all day for the Republican leadership to send us a bipartisan bill that should have voted on yesterday.

Unfortunately, the bill we're voting on tonight shows they didn't receive the message.

Not only have they put forward the same bill that failed yesterday, with the same troublesome offset and cuts as before, they have worsened it by casting a line to extreme members of their party.

Those Members who wanted an additional \$24 billion cut yesterday, I suspect, will not be lured by \$100 million tonight.

That is just four tenths of one percent of what they were demanding.

This new addition to the bill, which would cut loans for the construction of renewable energy projects that create jobs, is essentially an empty political attack on the administration.

Now is not the time for political games.

The American people want us to get serious on the deficit, and we had agreed on a way to do so.

They want us to get serious on jobs and this CR does just the opposite.

The CR we need to pass is one that adheres to the August budget deal.

There is already bipartisan agreement in the Senate on how to handle emergency disaster assistance, and we should follow that example.

Let's have a vote on a CR we can pass, one the senate can pass, and one that isn't set up to drive the parties further apart on budgetary issues.

Let's see a version that will bring us together.

As I said yesterday, I am ready to cast my vote for that CR, and I know other Democrats feel the same way.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this version, and I sincerely hope the Republican leadership will recognize why and work with us to do what's best for our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

This really is a simple bill. It's merely a bridge to get us until November

the 18th to continue the government basically as is until that time, to get us time to work with the Senate to put together the funding for all of fiscal 2012. NORM DICKS and I started out this year agreeing that we wanted to restore regular order to the Appropriations Committee and the process. And we've worked in that regard. The committee has dealt with 11 of the 12 appropriations bills. Six of them you've had a chance on the floor to amend and pass, which you have.

Unfortunately, our brethren across the Capitol have been a little bit slow, and they passed one bill, which necessitated that we do something to continue the government while we try to work with them to bring them along on their bills and fund fiscal 2012.

This bill started out as a bipartisan bill. We worked to make it so. But along the way, on the eve of the bill, all of a sudden we were confronted with a partisan attack from this side of the aisle, and we had no choice but to respond. But still yet this is a bipartisanly constructed bill. It doesn't attack anyone.

The Homeland Security bill that passed the body, you will recall, carried the provision that required that the billion dollars in that bill for FEMA would be offset from the automobile account that's been discussed. That passed this body in a bipartisan vote. Many Democrats voted for it, joined Republicans. No one raised a concern—until this bill came to the floor. And all of a sudden, there was this great eruption of partisanship on that side of the aisle, which I am very sad about.

But we will muddle through. This is a good bill. It funds your government at the level that was agreed to by the parties in the House, Senate, and White House, the level that is now the law. It funds us until November 18. And by then we hope to have worked out with our Senate brethren and sisters the funding for the rest of fiscal 2012.

So, the hour is late. Time is short. We've made up our minds. Let's vote.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, here they go again—House Republicans are driving America once more to the brink. They took us to the edge of a shutdown in April. They shoved us to the precipice of America's first ever default in August. And now after their similar attempt failed yesterday, House Republicans are again playing politics with the American economy, and American families.

Hurricane Irene leveled homes and businesses in the Northeast. An earthquake destroyed businesses in Mineral, Virginia. In my district, Tropical Storm Lee left hundreds of families homeless and damaged dozens of small businesses. And yet in this Continuing Resolution, House Republicans state they will only help those in extremis if we gut the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—a successful program that spurs American innovation and creates American jobs.

In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urged the retention of this important program stating it "promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component."

Americans don't need brinkmanship; they need predictability and security. This Continuing Resolution gives them neither. I would urge my colleagues to reject it in favor of one that protects Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2608, "The Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011," which provides for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 at the expense of job creating efforts.

The bill before us today is almost identical to the bill that we voted against yesterday. Mr. Speaker the bill before us will hurt jobs. The central issue before our country is jobs and the creation of jobs to secure our economy. We need to focus on talking about jobs. Instead, we are now once again focused on a measure that was rejected yesterday. The amendment added to this bill is clearly a desperate attempt by my Republican colleagues to pass their own ideological Continuing Resolution. This amendment would keep the same offset for disaster relief which will result in a \$1.5 billion cut to the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM), which has been a proven job creator, it created 35,000 jobs in the private sector. The purpose of the program is to enable American businesses to build the cars of the future that could be sold to China, rather than the reverse. It is intended to give us a technological boast in the auto industry. As if this was not enough, the amendment adds an additional cut—a rescission of \$100 million from the Recovery Act Renewable Energy Loan guarantee program, which is another cut to a program that creates jobs. A move to secure the votes of members concerned about the few party interests not the interests of Americans. This legislation causes the loss of American jobs!

The only broken record that I want to hear is the mantra of how to create jobs. Let us focus on putting the American people back to work, rather than bringing back measures that failed to garner support yesterday. I implore my colleagues to recall the reasons they rejected this measure in the first place and to do so again. Americans have always come to the aid of those in need, after a natural disaster.

Americans demonstrate a level of compassion that should not be damped by measures like the one before us today. Disaster relief funding is not a political football; it addresses the needs of Americans who find themselves the victims of unforeseeable natural disasters. It is born out of our nation's desire to aid those who are in need.

Now . . . now is not the time to trample on the needs of small business owners. Now is not the time to delay assistance to those who need support from FEMA. Now is not the time for a partisan position that will only cause more Americans to suffer while they have to wait on Congress to find balance. Now is the time for balance and reason.

Small businesses have long been the bedrock of our nation's economy. Even with the advent of modern-day multi-national corporations most of our day-to-day purchases take place at "mom and pop" small businesses.

This piece of legislation holds small businesses hostage in order to make a demand that has never been made by Republicans before. This demand changes their practice during previous administrations. In the past my

colleagues declared disaster funding as emergency spending and did not require offsetting emergency spending.

This bill would offset the \$1 billion in FY11 disaster relief funding using a program that is a proven job-creator, a program for small businesses. The very small businesses that are currently in need of access to loans and other lines of credit in order to build their businesses and create jobs. The very small businesses that are the life blood of our economy. These businesses, the “mom and pop” shops across our nation are being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle at the expense of jobs.

The future successes of their businesses are being held hostage in order to demand offsets of funds that have not required such an offset in the past. These funds would aid victims of natural disasters. To propose such a measure at a time when our economy is so fragile and when so many are struggling to survive is unfathomable.

At a time when our nation needs every single job we can create. Before us is a job killing measure. We need job creation to help families survive on smaller and smaller pay checks. Before us is legislation that places a halt on this growth. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the first time in our nation's history have added to this piece of legislation a requirement that disaster aid be offset. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) needs the \$6.9 billion in funding which has been approved in the Senate last week without requiring offset. My colleagues have cut this funding in half. They have offset this funding by decreasing the funds allotted by ending the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. These cuts cost Americans tens of thousands of jobs. Under the previous administration Republicans supported disaster relief without requiring an offset, on eight separate occasions but today they want to require cuts that will result in job loss.

As the Representative for Houston, which suffered severe damage in 2008 as a result of Hurricane Ike, I understand the importance of cleanup and rebuilding in the wake of natural disaster. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) addresses the challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

We must fund disaster relief. These are unforeseeable events. The devastating hurricanes in Texas in recent years is a perfect example. Our response to those events have demonstrated a need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Katrina, there were insufficient quantities of generators that forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

We must prepare our first responders with the best information and training to quickly analyze and share information to understand alerts and warning systems, evacuation plan-

ning, mission assignments to other agencies, contingency contracting, pre-staged resources, Regional Hurricane Plans and exercises, communications support, citizen preparedness, disaster housing, and long-term recovery planning. In order to accomplish this we must fund FEMA, not at the expense of small business but because Americans come together at times of crisis. This should be what it has always been—emergency funding.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the federal government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our Nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

On any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents. Cities and towns across the Nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises. Consider the devastation that was brought by the tornadoes in Alabama and the Southern United States, the flooding that has impacted the entire Mississippi River region, from Montana to Tennessee, and tornado that claimed more than 100 lives in Joplin, Missouri, have shown us that there are disasters we cannot predict, and forces of nature for which we cannot plan.

This legislation is a job killer, it is an affront to growing small businesses and will destroy thousands of jobs. I have been firmly committed to supporting small businesses and this legislation as written will fail to help create the jobs we need at this time. We should not prevent the growth of small business in order to address the unrealistic demands related to disaster relief funding.

Moreover, 99 percent of all independent companies and businesses in the United States are considered small businesses. They are the engine of our economy, creating two-thirds of the new jobs over the last 15 years. America's 27 million small businesses continue to face a lack of credit and tight lending standards, with the number of small businesses' loans down nearly 5 million since the financial crisis in 2008.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, these small businesses account for 52 percent of all U.S. workers. These small businesses also provide a continuing source of vitality for the American economy. Small businesses in the U.S. produced three-fourths of the economy's new jobs between 1990 and 1995, and represent an entry point into the economy for new groups. Women, for instance, participate heavily in small businesses.

The number of female-owned businesses climbed by 89 percent, to an estimated 8.1 million, between 1987 and 1997, and women-

owned sole proprietorships were expected to reach 35 percent of all such ventures by the year 2000. Small firms also tend to hire a greater number of older workers and people who prefer to work part-time.

A major strength of small businesses is their ability to respond quickly to changing economic conditions. They often know their customers personally and are especially suited to meet local needs. There are tons of stories of start-up companies catching national attention and growing into large corporations. Just a few examples of these types of start-up businesses making big include the computer software company Microsoft; the package delivery service Federal Express; sports clothing manufacturer Nike; the computer networking firm America OnLine; and ice cream maker Ben & Jerry's.

We must always ensure that we place a high level of priority on small businesses. It is also important that we work towards ensuring that small businesses receive all the tools and resources necessary for their continued growth and development.

American small businesses are the heart beat of our nation. I believe that small businesses represent more than the American dream—they represent the American economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of all employers, create half of our gross domestic product, and provide three out of four new jobs in this country.

Small business growth means economic growth for the nation. But to keep this segment of our economy thriving, entrepreneurs need access to loans. Through loans, small business owners can expand their businesses, hire more workers and provide more goods and services. The Small Business Administration (SBA), a federal organization that aids small businesses with loan and development programs, is a key provider of support to small businesses. The SBA's main loan program accounts for 30 percent of all long-term small business borrowing in America.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential. That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs. These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing. We must consider what impact changes in this appropriations bill will have on small businesses.

There are 5.8 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy. In 2007, minority owned businesses employed nearly 6 million Americans and generated \$1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% since 2002, and currently total close to 8 million. These organizations make up more than half of all businesses in health care and social assistance.

My home city of Houston, Texas is home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

According to a 2009 report published by the Economic Policy Institute, “Starting in 2004, the Small Business Administration (SBA) set goals for small business participation in federal contracts. It encouraged agencies to award contracts to companies owned by women, veterans, and minorities or those located in economically challenged areas and

gave them benchmarks to work toward. The targets are specific: 23% of contracts to small business, 5% to woman-owned small businesses, and 3% to disabled veteran-owned and HUBZone small businesses.”

Women and minority owned businesses generate billions of dollars and employ millions of people. They are certainly qualified to receive these contracts. A mandatory DOD outreach program women and minority owned businesses aware of all of the contract opportunities available to them.

Facts: Small businesses are important because they:

(1) Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms,

(2) Employ just over half of all private sector employees,

(3) Pay 44 percent of total U.S. private payroll,

(4) Generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years,

(5) Create more than half of the nonfarm private gross domestic product (GDP),

(6) Hire 40 percent of high tech workers (such as scientists, engineers, and computer programmers),

(7) Are 52 percent home-based and 2 percent franchises,

(8) Made up 97.3 percent of all identified exporters and produced 30.2 percent of the known export value in FY 2007,

(9) Produce 13 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms and twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the one percent most cited.

Republicans appear to be a mission to cut programs that help families and will buttress small businesses. At a time when there are Americans faced with the perils which arise during cleaning up after a natural disaster. Now is not the time to force those Americans to wait on a partisan battle, to pick a fight that has not been fought in eight previous authorizations of funds for disaster relief. There needs to be a balance when determining which programs to cut and when. A balance to finding the funds that will address national disasters. A balanced approach is important to ensuring that small business receive the support they need.

I stand here once again asking my colleagues to remember that just yesterday we opposed this bill. I implore you to do this once more. I support small business and job creation. I will not support small business growth being held hostage to the unrealistic demands made by my Republican colleagues. American families need measures that are job growers rather than measures that are jobs killers.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 727]

AYES—219

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

NOES—203

Ackerman	Butterfield	Costa
Amash	Capps	Costello
Andrews	Capuano	Courtney
Austria	Cardoza	Critz
Baca	Carnahan	Crowley
Baldwin	Carney	Cuellar
Barrow	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Bass (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Chandler	Davis (IL)
Berkley	Chu	DeFazio
Berman	Cicilline	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (MI)	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (NY)	DesJarlais
Blumenauer	Clay	Dicks
Boren	Cleaver	Dingell
Boswell	Clyburn	Doggett
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Donnelly (IN)
Braley (IA)	Connolly (VA)	Doyle
Broun (GA)	Conyers	Duncan (SC)
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Edwards

Ellison	Larson (CT)	Reyes
Engel	Lee (CA)	Richardson
Eshoo	Levin	Richmond
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Ross (AR)
Fattah	Lipinski	Rothman (NJ)
Filner	Loebsock	Roybal-Allard
Flake	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rush
Franks (AZ)	Lujan	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Lummis	Sánchez, Linda
Garamendi	Lynch	T.
Gingrey (GA)	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (GA)	Maloney	Sarbanes
Green, Al	Markey	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	Matheson	Schiff
Grijalva	Matsui	Schrader
Gutierrez	McClintock	Schwartz
Hahn	McCollum	Schweikert
Hanabusa	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Scott, David
Heinrich	McIntyre	Serrano
Higgins	McNerney	Sewell
Himes	Meeks	Sherman
Hinchev	Miller (NC)	Sires
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hirono	Moore	Smith (WA)
Hochul	Moran	Sutton
Holt	Mulvaney	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Nadler	Tierney
Huelskamp	Napolitano	Tonko
Huizenga (MI)	Neal	Towns
Hultgren	Olver	Tsongas
Inlee	Owens	Van Hollen
Israel	Pallone	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Vislosky
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Walsh (IL)
(TX)	Payne	Walz (MN)
Johnson (GA)	Pearce	Wasserman
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Schultz
Jordan	Perlmutter	Waters
Kaptur	Peters	Watt
Keating	Peterson	Waxman
Kildee	Pingree (ME)	Westmoreland
Kind	Poe (TX)	Wilson (FL)
King (IA)	Polis	Wilson (SC)
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Langevin	Quigley	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Gonzalez	Shuler
Deutch	Paul	Speier
Giffords	Rangel	Stark
Gohmert	Reichert	

□ 0050

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. While a celebration should be in order, I am disappointed the bill was considered on suspension, preventing amendments to improve the program.

The bill passed by this Chamber fails to correct a glaring mental health parity issue, which prevents the inclusion of children's psychiatric teaching hospitals in this program. Because these hospitals are classified by Medicare as psychiatric hospitals rather than as children's hospitals, they are ineligible for entry into the program.

In order to fix this oversight and to address the acute need for additional health care providers trained in child psychiatry, I introduced legislation, H.R. 2558, the Children's Hospitals Education Equity Act, which would include certain children's psychiatric hospitals in the definition to determine eligibility.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to correct this inequity and to advance our Nation another step closer to achieving full mental health parity.

GREGORY K. FRITZ: PARITY FOR KIDS' MENTAL HEALTH

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 30, 2011]
(By Gregory K. Fritz)

Despite the passage of the federal mental-health parity bill, stigma and prejudice are still alive and well when it comes to legislation affecting children's psychiatric hospitals. The latest example of how our government continues to maintain discriminatory funding policies specifically directed against children with mental-health issues involves federal support for graduate medical education (GME).

Although this issue is far overshadowed by the federal debt issue, those who care about the mental health of children need to be aware that achieving true parity still entails overcoming significant obstacles. Getting children's psychiatric hospitals recognized as legitimate sites of medical education is one such obstacle on the road to real parity that has both symbolic and pragmatic importance.

The history of federal support for training physicians during their hospital residencies goes back to the establishment of Medicare, in 1965. Recognizing that America needs a steady supply of physicians in all the areas of medicine, and that their training carries substantial additional expense for teaching hospitals, Medicare authorization includes a per-resident reimbursement that is provided to hospitals through a complicated formula. One element for determining GME payments is the percentage of a hospital's reimbursement that comes from Medicare. That children's hospitals would thus be excluded from the program (because Medicare pays virtually zero for children's medical care) was

unintentional, but it took 34 years for this oversight to be corrected.

The Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Payment Program (CHGME), in 1999, established a pool to provide residency education support to children's hospitals in a system modeled after the Medicare GME system. The unintentional disincentive to train pediatric generalists and specialists was removed and pediatric training accelerated dramatically. This year, a total of \$317.5 million offsets the training expenses of 5,500 residents at 46 children's hospitals, and the CHGME program is widely considered a success.

Parallel to the initial oversight in the Medicare bill, in the arcane definition of a children's hospital detailed in the CHGME regulations is language making it impossible for children's psychiatric hospitals to qualify. Only the most cynical observer would conclude that this was a deliberate attempt to exclude children's psychiatric hospitals and the child psychiatric and pediatric residents they train, especially since no medical specialty represents a greater shortage area than child and adolescent psychiatry. Yet, steady efforts since 2002 to correct this oversight have thus far been unsuccessful.

The CHGME reauthorization needed for the program to continue would seem to offer the ideal opportunity to end this de facto discrimination against children with mental-health problems. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse and Representatives David Cicilline and James Langevin, all Rhode Island Democrats, have offered similar versions of a brief amendment to the reauthorization that would correct the language to reflect the original bill's intent.

If passed, it would admit four or five children's psychiatric hospitals that meet strict criteria into the pool of hospitals eligible for CHGME reimbursement. A larger taxpayer outlay is not requested; rather, the existing money would be spread slightly more thinly (an estimated 30 additional residents would be added to the current 5,500). One would think it a small price to pay to correct an injustice, but passage is far from guaranteed.

As a child psychiatrist working at Bradley Hospital, one of the psychiatric hospitals that would finally be included, I'm far from dispassionate about this issue. I see every day the agony experienced by families with autism, childhood suicide, adolescent substance abuse or pediatric bipolar disorder; it's different, but no less severe, than the pain associated with juvenile diabetes or leukemia. As are all mental-health professionals, I'm troubled by the months-long waiting lists that prevent children's access to child psychiatric services.

The distinction between psychological and physiological disorders is artificial and antiquated, reflecting outdated fears and prejudices. In short, I see no valid reason to perpetuate the exclusion of children's psychiatric hospitals from the mechanism designed to support physicians' training. Neither do the thousands of members of 39 national organizations who have signed on to a letter urging support of the Whitehouse amendment. Mental-health parity is the law in principle; the CHGME reauthorization should make it be the case in practice.

Gregory K. Fritz, M.D., is academic director at Bradley Hospital and the editor of the Brown University Child and Adolescent Behavior Letter.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 633. An act to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, September 23, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3187. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Agricultural Swaps (RIN: 3038-AD21) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3188. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Dairy Promotion and Research Program; Final Rule on Amendments to the Order [Docket No.: DA-08-07; AMS-DA-08-0050] (RIN: 0581-AC87) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3189. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modifications of the Rules and Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0024; FV11-946-3 FIR] received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3190. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset Review (2011) [Document Number: AMS-TM-07-0136; TM-07-14FR] (RIN: 0581-AC77) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3191. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0015; FR] (RIN: 0581-AD03) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act,