

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FEDS SUING ARIZONA FOR DOING A JOB THE FEDS WON'T DO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department is suing Arizona for enforcing Federal laws that are already on the books. Other States and counties already have enforcement laws like Arizona's.

Prince William County in Virginia has laws almost identical to the new Arizona Senate Bill 1070 enforcement law. Police are allowed to check legal status at any time. Police are also required to check immigration status if anyone is arrested for anything, including DUI or public drunkenness.

According to Corey Stewart, the county board chairman, there has been a 37 percent drop in violent crime in the first 2 years of enforcement of this law. Overall, crime in Prince William County, Virginia, is at a 15-year low. Criminal aliens have fled that part of Virginia and gone somewhere elsewhere the laws are not enforced. Stewart says there has not been one substantiated claim of racial profiling.

Also, the State of Rhode Island enforces Federal immigration law by executive order, like the sanctuary cities, only in reverse. The Governor said his law enforcement officers must enforce this Federal law.

There are more States that follow suit. In Missouri, if police want to see

your ID papers to prove legal status, they are free to ask. Sanctuary cities are illegal in Missouri and they enforce the E-Verify system for employers. That's the free system set up by the Federal Government where all employers can check someone's immigration status. In Missouri, you have to be legal to get a driver's license and there is no in-State tuition for illegals at State junior colleges.

So why the double standard at the Justice Department and suing Arizona? Why are the Feds picking on Arizona and not these other States?

On the other hand, there are two laws that expressly forbid States from having sanctuary cities. The laws are found in title 8, section 1373 and title 8, section 1644 of the United States code.

These statutes say cities may not have policy that prohibits peace officers from communicating with the Federal Government about a person's immigration status. But there are cities across the country with policies banning their police from calling the Federal Government to report even criminal illegals.

In San Francisco, one recent case turned tragic. In 2008, there were three members of a family that were gunned down by Salvadoran illegals. Edwin Ramos is a member of the MS-13 narco-terrorist gang, and he is on trial for gunning down one of the members of this family. Two young sons of that family were also gunned down, Matthew and Michael were their names.

They were all in a car driving home from a family barbecue after church. They were not gang members, they were just citizens. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time, and Ramos, their accused killer, had been previously arrested three times.

San Francisco police knew he was an illegal alien MS-13 gang member. The San Francisco Chronicle reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason authorities never called the Federal Government. I repeat. The newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason the authorities did not call the Feds.

Instead of being detained and deported, gang member Edwin Ramos was released, and he killed a father and the two young brothers because of the Federal Government's tolerance to sanctuary cities. So the blood is on the hands of those who support the concept of sanctuary cities. There was even an eyewitness to the shooting, and Tony's youngest son, who survived the hail of bullets, was that witness.

Is the Justice Department suing San Francisco to stop this sort of irresponsible action? No, of course not.

Instead, the Justice Department is using taxpayer dollars to sue the State of Arizona for enforcing Federal laws. Arizona is not creating any new laws, they are merely enforcing the Federal law under concurrent jurisdiction.

The sanctuary cities pose a greater danger to American cities because they

give a sanctuary to all illegals. They shield criminal aliens from being detained and deported by the Federal Government, and sanctuary cities, in my opinion, operate in violation of the Federal Government law prohibiting such. But because of politics, the administration is suing Arizona for upholding the law and refuses to sue sanctuary cities for violating Federal law.

We hear the rhetoric that illegals do jobs Americans won't do. Now we have an actual situation where Arizona is getting sued for doing a job the American government won't do—protecting the security of the country and enforcing the law.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. HALVORSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S ECONOMY IS STRUGGLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America's economy is struggling. Despite all of the spending and promises out of Washington, a lot of average Americans, more than 15 million, are wondering where are the jobs, because they don't have one.

This Democrat Congress and this White House promised a lot to these workers and to the American taxpayer if they would just give them a blank check, if they could just write money like there was no tomorrow, that they, Washington, would know best how to get this economy back on track.

Unfortunately, the reality of the past 16 months since the stimulus bill passed has unfortunately been much less than what was promised.

The Obama administration likes to tout right now, they call this "the summer of recovery," but you don't see them touting. Because what their original promises were for that \$862 billion—more than a trillion dollars, when you add the interest to it, the taxpayers will actually have to pay back. The reality is that the Obama administration, the Democrats in Washington, failed on all three key promises to the American people about its economy.

They said our first promise is if you will pass this stimulus, the unemploy-

ment rate would remain below 8 percent. They said nonfarm payroll employment, that's most workers, would increase to 137.6 million by the end of this year. And then finally they said if you pass our stimulus bill, 90 percent of payroll jobs created would be in the private sector.

Well, let's look at the reality. It's been 16 months, a lot of the stimulus has been spent, not all, but a lot of it. So 16 months later, what do we see?

The Obama forecast was supposed to be at this point, almost 7.5 percent. Today it's actually 9.5 percent. That's a little lower than it's been. The reason it's lower: 650,000 Americans last month just gave up, gave up looking for work, gave up hope looking for work.

So that employment rate went down, not because the economy is getting better, but people have given up hope that they will get a job, 16 months after this magical stimulus bill was passed, so the actual versus the forecast is very sad.

□ 1940

Second promise, that the stimulus would raise employment, jobs in America, 137 million. This is where we're at right here, as stagnant as can be. In fact, right now, congressional Democrats and the White House, they are 7 million jobs short of where they promised they would be by the end of the year, 7 million jobs short. The economy has never created 7 million jobs in 6 months before. Short on promise number two, failed by a wide margin.

And here I think is the reason. I think this sums up why the stimulus failed, why so many Americans are disappointed with the Obama administration. I think the last poll was 13 percent of Americans believe the stimulus helped them in any way, 90 percent of Americans believe this economy is in bad shape, and almost three-fourths don't believe it's going to get better any time soon. So, so much for restoring consumer confidence in America's economy. And this is the real reason why, promise number three.

Remember, promise number one, below 8 percent, didn't come close; promise number two, we would have 137 million jobs by the end of this year, 7 million short. This is promise number three, that 90 percent of all the new jobs created by the stimulus would come from the private sector, not from government. They would come from small businesses back home along Main Street, the same small business and private sector jobs that have always brought America out of a deep recession.

Well, here's the actuality: Since the stimulus passed 16 months ago, hundreds of billions of dollars of money spent and wasted in America, guess what's happened? The only sector that has grown—the Federal Government. The Federal Government has added 400,000 government workers. How about the private sector? How about our

small businesses in every State across America? Lost almost 3.3 million jobs. Federal Government workers grew. State government came down a little, but they pumped a lot of stimulus money into more government workers. The private sector, the businesses that bring us out of the recession, lost 3.3 million jobs. That's why this economy is so subpar.

America is blessed. We are, I think, genetically predisposed to bouncing back from tough economic times. We hate to be in recession. But not this time. This recession, unfortunately, is continuing, not from a statistical sense, but from a jobs sense. It is one-third as strong a recovery as the Reagan recovery, and we can talk about that in a minute. But here's the reason why.

Washington has poured all this money into government workers and wasteful stimulus spending and they expect the economy to just jump-start. As they said, it will jump-start and consumer confidence will grow. The opposite has happened. Consumers, families are holding on to their money. They're frightened by the dangerous levels of debt in this country. They're frightened by \$13 trillion of national debt America owes in publicly held debt. And businesses are frightened these days.

As one of the Secretaries of Labor here in Washington said: Businesses aren't adding jobs because they're waiting to see what government can do for them; businesses aren't adding jobs because they're frightened by what government will do to them. They see an environment in Washington, proposals that dramatically increase taxes, increase regulation, increase their health care costs, increase their energy costs, that broaden government, expand regulation into almost every nook and cranny of this economy. And they look at that and they say, No, you know, we're going to delay rehiring people we laid off, hiring new ones. We're going to delay that critical investment decision, that expansion decision, the decision to buy that new piece of equipment because we don't want to be punished by Washington for adding jobs. We don't want to be punished if we go out and hire that new worker or buy that new piece of equipment. And that uncertainty, unfortunately, is an anchor around our economic recession. And that uncertainty means that American businesses are holding on to almost \$2 trillion of cash, \$2 trillion, normally enough to, again, start bringing us out of this recession. They're not willing to do that.

They're frightened by this White House. They're frightened by Washington, D.C. They look at what's happening in Congress and these wild proposals, extreme, ideologically driven agendas, and they're saying, We're going to play it safe and stand pat with their money. Consumers are doing it because of the debt, businesses because of these terrible antibusiness, antijob,