

mark this occasion, it is appropriate to reflect on the progress that Puerto Rico has made in fulfilling the aspirations expressed in our Constitution and to acknowledge the distance we have left to travel.

Our Constitution reflects the values and dreams of our people. Its words reinforce our commitment to democracy and equality and confirm that we treasure both our Puerto Rican roots and our American citizenship.

Over time, the bonds between Puerto Rico and the United States have grown stronger. Like so many American stories, this is the chronicle of progress, evolution, and the steady march towards a more perfect Union.

But the aspirations of our Constitution have yet to be realized. There will be no democracy for Puerto Rico until its people have a real voice in making the national laws that govern their lives, and there will be no equality so long as they can be treated differently than their fellow citizens simply because they live in a territory.

Today I renew my pledge to fight so that one day democracy and equality will prevail in Puerto Rico.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on its 75th anniversary, August 14, Social Security is once again under assault by congressional Republicans. Social Security has been, for 75 years, a bedrock promise. You earned it with a lifetime of hard work, and it should be there for you for future generations.

If Republicans had succeeded, seniors would have lost trillions more in the stock market meltdown of the Bush recession. But, instead, no one lost a penny in Social Security.

Social Security is not the cause of our budget deficits, and benefit cuts should not be the solution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4213, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1550 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1550

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a

motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment 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 Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1550.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010, finally.

The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Finally, the rule provides that the Senate amendment shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010, ensures that much-needed Federal assistance continues to reach the millions of Americans struggling to find a job, trying to keep their homes and doing the best they can to provide for their families.

This legislation is long overdue with unemployment benefits having expired on June 1 of this year. Though I am pleased that this legislation is retroactive to that date, millions of Americans who desperately needed our support were left hanging by the egregious obstructionism that prevented this legislation from moving forward.

While the other party is content with giving themselves a pat on the back for every roadblock they throw in front of the Democratic bill, I remind my col-

leagues that they are playing with the livelihoods of countless, hardworking Americans. What is merely a political win for them is, in reality, another family that can't make rent, can't send their kids to college, or can't pay their medical bills.

As we are well aware, much of the debate surrounding this bill has centered on its cost. Now, we, in the Democratic Party, believe that balancing the budget is vital for our long-term prosperity, but it cannot be done on the backs of struggling Americans.

Over the past few weeks, my Republican colleagues have railed on about Democrats not cutting the deficit or spending beyond our means. But I wonder if my Republican colleagues have looked in the mirror lately.

I have been here for some time; and I can't, for the life of me, remember any calls for fiscal discipline when their party was cutting taxes for millionaires and billionaires, sending a blank check overseas, or squandering \$127 billion Federal budget surplus.

Time and again, my colleagues' actions simply do not match their rhetoric. Further cutting the budget and denying unemployment benefits aren't going to make jobs magically appear.

□ 1030

Such actions will only cause our economy to contract and leave more people out in the cold. Our economy needs a deliberate, targeted approach to job creation and economic growth, and that is what Democrats will provide.

To say, as my colleagues often do, that Democrats are moving in the wrong direction and doing nothing to create jobs is simply a bold-faced lie. Over the last 1½ years we've gone from a period of negative growth to consistent increases in our GDP. We've gone from 22 months of job loss to 6 straight months of private-sector job creation, albeit not nearly enough. We've gone from shuttered factories to the largest 12-month gain in industrial production since 1998. Make no mistake, job creation is the number one priority for Democrats, but as the job market recovers, there remain far too many who are out of work and losing hope.

While my Republican colleagues question the need to lend a hand to those who are struggling, I question their aversion to provide opportunity to those who have none. Maybe there are no poor people in some of my colleagues' districts, but in the district that I am privileged to represent, people are hurting. From Pahokee to Pembroke Pines, people simply cannot find work. They are pounding the pavement, willing to take anything that comes their way, and in the meantime they need our help.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what Republicans seem to consider reckless spending, the people in the district that I serve consider a vital lifeline. There are 170,000 Floridians that are unemployed at this time. What Republicans

call government waste, the American people call an essential government service. And what Republicans see as a bloated budget, our citizens see as the only thing that is keeping them from financial ruin.

The other party can continue to play political theater, but we have serious work to do. The American people cannot afford to wait a second longer. They need this extension. They deserve this extension. And we will not let Republican obstructionism prevent them from getting this extension.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will make a prediction for you. After all of the talk for all of these months, all of the obstruction to us having unemployment compensation extended that had been routinely extended since 1959 without the kind of obstruction that it met, particularly in the other body, I predict for you that a significant number of our Republican colleagues today are going to vote for unemployment compensation. And in that regard, I'm glad they came to the dance, albeit a little late.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4213, a bill extending unemployment insurance. Republicans know that we must reduce the deficit, and if the underlying bill had been paid for, Republicans would have gladly supported it, but it is not.

Undoubtedly, the American people are suffering from the actions of this Democrat-controlled Congress. We go home every weekend and our constituents tell us that their concerns are both jobs and the debt. In fact, they tell us every weekend they are frightened to death for the future of this country. I've never had constituents tell me that before this year.

The simple truth is that while the liberals have repeatedly claimed their \$1 trillion 2009 stimulus plan was the right thing to do, it's hard to tell that from looking at the job situation across the U.S. The American people are facing high unemployment rates and economic uncertainty. In fact, we have a quote from our distinguished Chair of the Federal Reserve, "Economic future unusually uncertain" is the headline in *The Washington Times* today. But we need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real, common-sense solutions to their real problems that we must be willing to pay for.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The question of unemployment benefits being conflated with the debt that was caused by tax cuts that we couldn't afford—\$2.3 trillion—by a war that was on the credit card, President Bush's war in Iraq that cost over \$1 trillion and rising, a Medicare part D program unfunded, put on the credit card, that drove this economy into a ditch. If there's going to be honest discussion about what caused this debt, then we've got to go back in history—and not distant history—to acknowledge that it was the reckless spending policies of the Republican administration and George Bush that contributed more to this debt than any other administration in the history of this entire country.

George Bush, in 8 years, accumulated more debt by more reckless decisions than all of the Presidents who preceded him. All of those decisions, incidentally, were discretionary decisions: A war of choice—wrong war, wrong time—put on the credit card of the American taxpayers; tax cuts that did not stimulate the economy but burdened us with generations of debt; a Medicare prescription drug program where the choice was not only to put it on the credit card but to make it embedded in law the unwillingness of the Federal Government to negotiate bulk price discounts with the drug companies. It guaranteed high prices at the expense of the taxpayers and our consumers. That is the legacy of debt that brought us to this situation.

Then, there is some joint responsibility. This economic collapse we had as a result of the implosion of Wall Street that happened basically 2 years ago today, there were many reasons for that, but it was excess debt, reckless speculation on the part of the folks on Wall Street, and it led to this economic crisis that we have right now.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to providing unemployment benefits for people who had no responsibility for getting us here, when it comes to the question of who is going to pay the price, should it be the victims of these reckless decisions, the squandering of choices that we had to make the right decision at the right time to build jobs? Should the people who are the victims of reckless policies in Washington—and in many cases by the Republican administration, in some cases because of joint lax regulation by both administrations, Democratic and Republican—are we going to impose the burden of those bad choices on the people who had no responsibility and are the victims? That would be wrong.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say in response that, yes, George W. Bush was responsible for what was then the worst debt in the Nation. That was a terrible public policy, and I make no apologies for it. But it needs to be pointed out that this administration and this Congress in just 2 years have run up as much debt as the irresponsible Bush administration did in all 8 years combined. Yes, that was irresponsible fiscal policy. Why in the world would you want to exacerbate and continue that bad policy? Republicans have learned their lesson. It appears that lesson has not yet been learned on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has experienced firsthand the quiet panic that stalks every waking hour of an unemployed family knows how frightening and debilitating is chronic unemployment. You watch your savings evaporate, you watch your children going without the material things that their friends enjoy, and you count down the months or even days until you won't be able to make that crucial rent or house payment.

□ 1040

That unemployment check is a lifeline in such times, and I fully appreciate and understand how desperately an unemployed family is looking to the security of getting 99 weeks of such checks, but I can't go along with this for a simple reason: The only way out of this nightmare of unemployment for these families is a job.

Speaker PELOSI and others have said the most important thing we can do to create jobs is to extend unemployment benefits to 99 weeks because the unemployed would spend this money and stimulate the economy. Well, this analysis completely ignores the harsh and glaring fact that, before this money can be put back into the economy, it must first be taken out of the very same economy.

We will have to take \$34 billion more out of the economy in order to finance these extra benefits through November. In fact, this is the eighth such extension, totaling \$120 billion. That means over \$1,600 from the pocket of an average family of four in America. Since we don't have that money, we will have to borrow it from exactly the same capital pool that would otherwise have been available to loan to businesses seeking to expand jobs or to home buyers seeking to reenter the housing market or to consumers seeking to make consumer purchases.

Remember, two-thirds of economic growth depend upon consumer spending, but that money now won't be there to loan for jobs and homes and economic growth. This is \$34 billion of relief to the unemployed that they desperately need and that I desperately wish we could responsibly extend, but to do so would also mean \$34 billion of fewer jobs. It would mean perpetuating this never-ending nightmare of unemployment for these families and, indeed, throwing more families into that nightmare.

We have been told for several years now by Presidents Bush and Obama that stimulus spending would help the economy, but it hasn't, and there is a reason it hasn't. Government cannot inject a single dollar into the economy that it has not first taken out of that very same economy. Government cannot provide a dollar of temporary relief to the unemployed without first removing a dollar of permanent relief for the unemployed—namely, a job.

The talking point du jour from the other side is, well, the Republicans have no problems giving tax breaks to the wealthy but won't extend a lifeline to the unemployed. Well, once again, they just don't get it.

Milton Friedman once observed that spending is the effective rate of taxation. Spending can only be paid for in two ways—either by current taxes or by future taxes to retire borrowing. High taxes and deficits are just the symptom. The problem is the spending, and this is a spending bill.

On May 9 of 1939, after nearly a decade of unemployment checks and stimulus spending and with unemployment at 17.2 percent, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, made this stunning admission during a meeting with Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee:

He said, No, gentlemen. We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work. I have just one interest, and if I am wrong, as far as I am concerned, somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosperous. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say, after 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

Mr. Speaker, let us heed the lessons of history before we totally destroy our economy. Perpetual unemployment checks put these desperate families farther and farther away from the only thing that can truly end their suffering—a real job. That is a fact nobody around here wants to face, but until we do, chronic unemployment will continue to stalk the land, and God forbid, a few years from now, another Democratic Treasury Secretary will have to make the same admission as Henry Morgenthau did 71 years ago.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I just heard.

I heard what Franklin Roosevelt said. I've read what Franklin Roosevelt said. I was alive during that period of time, and I saw what happened during Franklin Roosevelt's administration. My parents, among many others, got jobs during that period of time, and they came out of the Depression, and this country soared as a result of the policies of the Roosevelt administration. We will be very wise in this country if we could possibly implement the wonderful things that he did.

I yield, Mr. Speaker, 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California just said that, by extending and perpetuating unemployment benefits to families, it will somehow destroy the economic future of these families. Everyone is entitled to their own opinions, Mr. Speaker.

I think the reality is, if you take away people's ability to pay their rent or their utility bills or their credit card bills, you absolutely destroy them. The issue before the House today is whether or not 2.5 million Americans, whose unemployment benefits have expired or are about to expire, should get extensions. I emphatically believe that they should.

Now, the argument that we have heard from the other side—first, about not even taking a vote on this issue and now against extending those benefits—is twofold.

The first, which we just heard a version of, is that to extend their unemployment benefits somehow zaps the incentive for people to look for jobs. I would challenge anybody who makes that assertion to go meet 10 or 100 or 500 unemployed people and ask them just how many want ads they have circled, just how many resumes they have sent out, and just how hard they have looked for jobs, and I think that will put that argument to rest.

The second argument is a good faith argument that people do not want to add to the national debt. First of all, this is a selective argument. Nearly two-thirds of the national debt was accumulated during the administrations of Presidents Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush.

Most recently, when the past administration added to the national debt by prosecuting an endless occupation of Iraq with borrowed money, virtually no one on the other side raised this issue. Most recently, when the prior administration dramatically reduced the taxes of the top 5 percent of the people in this country by borrowing the money, virtually no one on the other side raised this issue.

Today, Members on the other side, both in the other body and here, have taken the position that, while extending benefits to janitors and bus drivers and salespeople who have lost their jobs is somehow fiscally irresponsible if you don't offset it, extending tax breaks to the top 5 percent of the people in the country on a permanent basis is completely responsible.

So, in other words, the person who was laid off from her job of cleaning an office building can't get unemployment benefits unless there is a spending cut or a tax increase to pay for it, but the person who owns the office building, who could get a \$500,000 tax cut, could

get that with borrowed money. This makes no sense.

What does make sense is a "yes" vote on today's bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER. I appreciate the gentleman's extending some time.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here in front of you and to spend some time talking about these unemployment benefits that we have in front of us today.

We had some, of course, unfortunate information come out of the administration as to the unemployment numbers for the last month. They actually went up in the State of Nevada. Right now, the unemployment rate in the State of Nevada is at 14.2 percent. In the city of Las Vegas, that unemployment number is at 14.5 percent. That is the worst unemployment of any place across this Nation, so it is very disheartening. The question, I guess, that I have, Mr. Speaker, is:

Who do we hold responsible? Who do we hold responsible for the failed economic policies of this Congress and this administration?

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that the unemployed are the ones who should be held accountable for these failures. Despite the promises from this administration that a stimulus bill would cap unemployment at 8 percent, we are seeing across this Nation numbers much higher than that. We continue to see Nevada grow from 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent, and now to 14.2 percent. It was supposed to be an immediate jolt. Clearly, it didn't happen. The truth is the stimulus has failed the American people and the people of the great State of Nevada.

I want to read a letter that I received recently from one of my constituents, Heidi, from the city of Sparks, Nevada.

She writes, "I need you to really try and understand just how difficult things are for some, if not most of us, still unemployed here in the lovely State of Nevada."

□ 1050

"I have been unemployed for just about 6 months now. My husband was laid off back in November, recently took a job for a considerably less amount just to get a job. I have been on several interviews, filled out countless applications, and sent my resume to countless companies."

Heidi worked for the same company for 6 years, her husband, laid off after working 13 years.

It just goes to expand the failed policies that we're seeing here in this Congress, coming out of this Congress and coming out of the administration.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield? I will yield the gentleman 15 seconds of my time if he would answer a question.

Mr. HELLER. I will be more than happy to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What do you think would have happened had the stimulus bill not passed?

Mr. HELLER. In other words, you're asking me what would have happened if we took all this money out of the private sector and put it in the public sector? Is that the question you're asking me?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What would have happened to those teachers, what would have happened to those police officers who kept their jobs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's 15 seconds has expired.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe we need private sector money given to private sector government given to private people, not more public jobs. And that's what the other side continues to argue.

But I will tell you that Members on both sides, both sides of the aisle are trying to help the unemployed. But what the argument here is, do we continue to add \$34 billion to the \$13 trillion in debt that we now have here in this country. And that's the argument.

And if you want to ask another question, how do you plan on paying for it, there was a rule. There was an opportunity for the Rules Committee to pay for this.

How often is the left and how often is the majority party saying that the unemployment is a stimulus to this economy? That's great. And if you want to go down that road, what I would argue is then take the stimulus dollars that are unused and use it to pay for these unemployment benefits. You can do it. You can do it. It's not that you can't do it; it's that you won't do it. And that makes no sense.

I had that substitute amendment in the Rules Committee. Of course it failed. I think it's unfortunate. What we're doing here today is that we're going to pass this bill. I'm going to vote against the rule. I will vote for the bill, but I'm voting against the rule.

And the problem with this is we're going to pass this bill and what we're going to do is we're going to go on a 6-week vacation. That's what we're doing here. We're going to go on a 6-week vacation. And what we're going to say is that, hey, we're going to extend these unemployment benefits, but we're going to get full pay for 6 weeks while we're on vacation. Why don't we stay here, Mr. Speaker?

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HELLER. I want to stay here over the 6-week period, put some economic, bipartisan economic policies together so the people like Heidi from the city of Sparks, Nevada, can get a job. I think that's what we ought to be doing here in Washington, D.C. instead of casting a vote, ducking and hiding, running out for a 6-week vacation.

I ask a question: Who's to be held responsible for the failed economic policies of this Congress and this administration? And I don't believe it should be the unemployed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take a degree in trigonometry to understand that if you spend \$34 billion helping unemployed people who should have been helped in the first place much longer ago, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, a very neutral concern that analyzes these matters, for every dollar spent, \$1.90 comes back into the economy. That would, by my count, add up to spending \$34 billion and having come into the economy \$64.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is simply the morally right thing to do. And as I listen to the bantering and the chattering and the constant obstructionist policies of my friends, Republicans in this body and the other body, I'm amazed that there is no moral compass to say that millions of Americans, those who have worked, are simply asking that they be able to survive.

This is not a handout. This is a trust, a contract, that when you work you invest in unemployment insurance to a certain extent, first given by the States, and now, because the States have run out of money, our federal government, their government is extending those dollars. And we know that it's the right thing to do because those people on the other side of the aisle have allowed this obstructionism to go forward, but they couldn't fight it anymore.

They couldn't fight 62 percent of the American public who said this is the right thing to do. They couldn't fight the Congressional Budget Office who said this is the most cost-effective and fast-acting infusion of dollars to help people pay their mortgage and food and car payments and to stay off the streets, and to improve the economy.

And further, Mr. Speaker, Chairman Bernanke said, It's no time for the deficit hawks to raise their heads. Continuing to stimulate the economy is the right approach.

What we, as Democrats, are doing, infusing dollars into the economy, is the best approach to get the economy to grow. Corporate revenues grew in the last quarter, but corporations are hoarding their money, for now. I believe we will see more job creation soon.

We are creating jobs and therefore we must continue to stimulate this economy by these unemployed individuals having resources to buy into the economy and to make a difference.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and allowing me to say that all of the economists point to the fact that we're doing the right thing. I ask the Republicans to join us today and stand as Americans and do what is right for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4213, "The American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010". I am primarily concerned with the unemployment provision in this piece

of legislation. If passed, this bill will restore unemployment aid to 2.5 million Americans who have lost their benefits and are still seeking work in this emerging economy. It will give hope to the long-term unemployed and allow them a chance to survive by extending their benefits to November 30th, 2010.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a single federal program that is absolutely critical to people in communities all across this nation at this time, it would be unemployment compensation benefits. Unemployed Americans must have a means to subsist, while continuing to look for work that in many parts of the country is just not there. Families have to feed children. Unemployed workers, many of whom rely on public transportation, need to be able to get to potential employers' places of work. Utility payments must be paid. Most people use their unemployment benefits to pay for the basics. No one is getting rich from unemployment benefits, because the weekly benefit checks are solely providing for basic food, medicine, gasoline and other necessary things many individuals with no other means of income are not able to afford.

Personal and family savings have been exhausted and 401(K)s have been tapped, leaving many individuals and families desperate for some type of assistance until the economy improves and additional jobs are created. The extension of unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed is an emergency. You do not play with people's lives when there is an emergency. We are in a crisis. Just ask someone who has been unemployed and looking for work, and they will tell you the same.

With a national unemployment rate of 9.5 percent, preventing and prolonging people from receiving unemployment benefits is a national tragedy. In the city of Houston, the unemployment rate stands at 8.3 percent as almost 250,000 individuals remain unemployed. Indeed, I can not tell you how difficult it has been to explain to my constituents who are unemployed that there will be no further extension of unemployment benefits until the Congress acts. Whether the justification for inaction is the size of the debt or the need for deficit reduction, it is clear that it is more prudent to act immediately to give individuals and families looking for work a means to survive.

H.R. 4213 is just the right measure at the right time. The legislation will send a message to the nation's unemployed, that this Congress is dedicated to helping those trying to help themselves. Until the economy begins to create more jobs at a much faster pace, and the various stimulus programs continue to accelerate project activity in local communities, we cannot sit idly and ignore the unemployed. As such, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4213.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend from Grandfather Community North Carolina for her thoughtful approach in dealing with what is obviously an extraordinarily difficult issue.

Night before last I had one of the telephone town hall meetings that many of our colleagues have regularly now, and there was an unemployed truck driver who was on the line saying that he had, for 1 year, been looking for a job. I said, are you going out every day? And he said, well, actually I'm going out every other day because I've got responsibilities taking care of my family. But he said that he is out working very hard to find a job. And he said we need to do what we can to ensure that those of us who are hurting do have access to those benefits.

Then he went on to say, after I had talked about the desire for us to, with our \$1 trillion-plus budget, we have a budget well in excess of \$1 trillion, that we might be able to find \$34 billion to pay for this.

He said, that makes so much sense. He said, please try to do that. And when you do it, then we'll be able to have the unemployment benefits that we need right now just to survive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the notion of pay-as-you-go was not a Republican initiative. It was an initiative led by Democrats; and, in fact, as we saw the Democrats emerge to majority, pay-as-you-go has been the Holy Grail. In fact, we've heard constantly that pay-as-you-go would be utilized to deal with spending legislation, meaning we would offset it by bringing about spending cuts in other areas.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that my friend Mr. HELLER was absolutely right when he came before the Rules Committee this morning and made his case that he proposed an offset so that this truck driver in southern California with whom I spoke 2 nights ago would be able to get his benefits, and we would also be able to do what this unemployed truck driver wants, and that is for us to do what he said was a commonsense approach, to pay for it. I think Mr. HELLER really hit the nail right on the head when he said you can do it; it's just that you won't do it.

I have to say, and I said this when I stood here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I like to be a positive, Ronald Reagan optimist. But when we know that the majority can in fact pay for this and they know that we are desperately concerned about the fact that an attempt is being made, as Mr. MCCLINTOCK pointed out in his thoughtful remarks, that we're exacerbating the spending problem, which did go on under the Bush administration, but has gotten substantially worse in the last 18 months—in fact, we all know we've seen an 84 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And so we've said, okay, we'll go along, and we want to see if we can find in this \$1 trillion-plus budget \$34 billion to offset so that we can pay for these benefits.

The other side of the aisle has chosen not to do it, I think in large part to put some of us in a position of saying, well, if you're not going to do this, if you're

just going to blindly continue with \$34 billion in additional spending, we're not going to go for it. And what is it they want to do, Mr. Speaker? They of course want to paint us as being on the other side of those who are trying to make ends meet.

Again, we've seen constantly this class warfare argument. And to me it's a failed argument. I like to quote the late Senator Paul Tsongas. We are very pleased to have his widow serve here as our colleague from Massachusetts. Senator Tsongas had this very clear approach when he was running for President in 1992. He said, "The problem with my Democratic Party is that they love employees, but they hate employers."

And, Mr. Speaker, as you look at that argument, this perpetuation of class warfare, tax cuts for the rich, throwing people who are on unemployment out into the streets without having any concern for them whatsoever, that argument really falls very flat because I believe that the American people understand that we truly do care. We do want to create opportunity for everyone. And those who are desperately in need should in fact have their needs met. And we want to do what we can.

Now, I will say that this measure extends for people going onto unemployment, unemployment benefits for 99 weeks. Ninety-nine weeks. Now, that's almost 2 years. Now, I hope very much, as Mr. HELLER said, that we can put into place a bipartisan approach, a bipartisan approach to deal with economic policy that can get this economy growing.

We know that we were promised an unemployment rate that would not exceed 8 percent if we passed the \$1 trillion stimulus bill. And in part of the area that I represent in southern California, the unemployment rate is 14.4 percent. Statewide for us in California, just announced this week, it's 12.3 percent. Nationally, it's 9.5 percent. Well, it's well in excess of what we were promised.

So why don't we try to do what has succeeded in the past, using again the model of John F. Kennedy and the model of Ronald Reagan. When John F. Kennedy's economic growth plan was put into place in 1961, marginal rate reduction, growth-oriented, growth-oriented tax cuts. I was just talking to my friend Mr. WELCH, the gentleman from Vermont. And it's true every tax cut does not generate economic growth. But if we had growth-oriented tax cuts, we could do, I would hope, what John F. Kennedy was able to do in the 1960s. He saw a 60 percent increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. Economic growth generated more revenues.

We know that we need to increase revenues. We desperately need to increase revenues to deal with the spending that has taken place, and to try and pay down this \$13 trillion debt. In the 1980s the increased flow of revenues

to the Treasury was 90 percent when the Ronald Reagan tax plan was put into place. It's a bipartisan approach, exactly what Mr. HELLER said.

Mr. Speaker, let's use that as our model, which will be substantially better than what is being put before us today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to tell me the remaining time for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is it's about time. And to my friends on the other side of the aisle, let me say it's a shame that it has taken this long. For 7 weeks, millions of Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own have worried about how they are going to pay for their groceries, pay for their rent, pay for their mortgage, or pay for their children's college tuitions. They have sat around their kitchen tables and made tough decisions about their family budgets. And through this all they have continued to apply for job after job after job.

That's what unemployed Americans have been doing during these last 7 weeks. But what have the Senate Republicans done to help them, to restore benefits to Americans who have earned them through a lifetime of work? They've done nothing. My friends on the other side of the aisle talked about the need to extend the Bush tax cuts for their wealthy friends, which they don't want to pay for.

I mean here's the deal: they don't worry about the deficit when it comes to tax cuts for millionaires, but when it comes to working people who are confronting difficult times, who are faced with an emergency, all of a sudden they got religion when it comes to the deficit. They made a lot of noise about characterizing unemployment benefits as a government handout or somehow encouraging lazy behavior. But I would challenge any of my Republican colleagues to say those things face-to-face to someone who has been out of work for a year, who has applied for job after job after job without getting a response.

Mr. Speaker, the facts don't lie. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, extending unemployment benefits is the most efficient way for the government to generate economic growth. Each \$1 spent on unemployment benefits creates up to \$1.90 in economic output. Extending these benefits also creates jobs and decreases the chances that we slip into a double-dip recession.

In every other economic crisis in American history, Democrats and Republicans have put aside their partisan differences and provided emergency unemployment benefits to those Americans who have lost their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats did our job. On July 1, we passed an extension of benefits that would have restored benefits for those who lost them in early June. It would have also ensured that jobless Americans would have the peace of mind of knowing that benefits were available to them to the end of November while they continue to apply for jobs. And since then we have worked and reworked this benefits extension to try to address Republican concerns. But every time, every single time we have been stonewalled by Republican obstructionism. They would rather use unemployed Americans as political pawns instead of restoring benefits to good, decent, hard-working people who have earned them over a lifetime of work.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Enough of the politics. Let us extend these benefits to the hardworking people who have lost their jobs, who are dealing with this difficult economic time. This is the right thing to do. This is the decent thing to do. We should have done it a long time ago. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have to remind my colleagues across the aisle again that the Democrats have been in control of Congress since January 2007, and we have had a Democrat in the White House for almost 2 years. So the Democrats have been in control and Republicans are in the minority, and the Democrats can do what they want to because of their numbers in Congress.

While the Obama administration continues its so-called summer of recovery, Mr. Speaker, claiming the Democrats' stimulus bill saved or created 3 million jobs, the facts are 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the stimulus passed. Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee released a report on Tuesday that showed this data, and I would like to insert this report into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this report compares the number of jobs created in each State that the administration currently claims in a White House report issued July 14 with the actual change in jobs since the stimulus became law as documented by the administration's own Department of Labor. It shows that only Alaska, Kentucky, and North Dakota, along with the District of Columbia, have shown any real job growth since the stimulus passed. And even in those States, the official job creation has fallen far short of administration claims.

□ 1110

The administration claims that every State and the District of Columbia

have seen a positive job growth. This is simply not true when you look at the actual numbers from the Department of Labor.

And let me say that in Alaska, only 2,200 jobs have been created since the stimulus passed. In Kentucky, 2,400 jobs; and in North Dakota, only 5,100 jobs. And most of us know that in North Dakota it's because of the discovery of energy. And that compares with what the administration has said they created 8,000 in North Dakota, they claim 41,000 in Kentucky, they claim 7,000 in Alaska. So the numbers are quite different.

But let me point out that in the District of Columbia where there are government jobs that have been created and lobbyist jobs that have been created as a result of this administration's policies, there are 7,800 jobs. So the bulk of the jobs that have been created are government jobs.

Republicans don't think this is right, neither do the American people think this is right. We need real jobs in the private sector.

47 OUT OF 50 STATES HAVE LOST JOBS SINCE DEMOCRATS' STIMULUS LAW—TUESDAY, JULY 20, 2010

While the Obama Administration continues their so-called "Recovery Summer" tour claiming the Democrats' stimulus bill "saved or created" three millions jobs, the facts show 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since stimulus passed. The table below compares the number of jobs the Administration currently claims its stimulus has somehow created in each State (center column) with the actual change in jobs since stimulus became law (right hand column), as documented by the Department of Labor. It shows that only Alaska, Kentucky and North Dakota, along with the District of Columbia, have shown any real job growth since stimulus passed and even in those States the official job creation has fallen far short of Administration claims.

"Americans are asking where are the jobs, but all Washington Democrats are showing them is more unemployment, debt and higher deficits," said Ways and Means Ranking Member Dave Camp (R-MI).

State	Administration claims of change in jobs through June 2010	Actual change in jobs through June 2010
Alabama	+42,000	-45,500
Alaska	+7,000	+2,200
Arizona	+64,000	-80,300
Arkansas	+26,000	-12,600
California	+357,000	-520,200
Colorado	+50,000	-84,600
Connecticut	+38,000	-34,000
Delaware	+9,000	-5,500
DC	+16,000	+7,800
Florida	+167,000	-152,200
Georgia	+91,000	-124,600
Hawaii	+13,000	-12,700
Idaho	+15,000	-14,600
Illinois	+140,000	-155,000
Indiana	+68,000	-29,800
Iowa	+34,000	-23,700
Kansas	+28,000	-34,200
Kentucky	+41,000	+2,400
Louisiana	+39,000	-17,300
Maine	+14,000	-11,400
Maryland	+53,000	-14,300
Massachusetts	+79,000	-36,700
Michigan	+102,000	-91,400
Minnesota	+60,000	-47,900
Mississippi	+26,000	-25,400
Missouri	+59,000	-48,300
Montana	+10,000	-3,100
Nebraska	+17,000	-10,300
Nevada	+29,000	-64,300
New Hampshire	+13,000	-100
New Jersey	+94,000	-68,300
New Mexico	+19,000	-30,900
New York	+206,000	-115,400

State	Administration claims of change in jobs through June 2010	Actual change in jobs through June 2010
North Carolina	+90,000	-49,700
North Dakota	+8,000	+5,100
Ohio	+117,000	-131,500
Oklahoma	+35,000	-33,500
Oregon	+41,000	-49,000
Pennsylvania	+130,000	-71,600
Rhode Island	+11,000	-15,200
South Carolina	+41,000	-15,100
South Dakota	+8,000	-4,100
Tennessee	+60,000	-69,400
Texas	+225,000	-57,700
Utah	+27,000	-11,000
Vermont	+7,000	-7,300
Virginia	+73,000	-39,500
Washington	+67,000	-68,600
West Virginia	+16,000	-10,200
Wisconsin	+63,000	-82,000
Wyoming	+6,000	-9,900

Sources: July 14, 2010, White House.
Council of Economic Advisors report and Ways and Means Republican Staff calculations based on Department of Labor data.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you very much for yielding.

Let me tell you something about the State of Nevada. We have the highest unemployment rate in the country—14½ percent unemployed—our fellow citizens with no jobs to go to and no jobs to seek. We have the highest mortgage foreclosure rate in the country. Nevadans are suffering.

It has taken far too long for this Congress to act. Unemployment benefits are not a handout. It's not welfare. It's giving a helping hand to our fellow citizens that need it the most, to get them where they are now—which is without a job—to where they're going to be when there is an economic recovery.

The gentleman from northern Nevada had an amendment in the Rules Committee that said unobligated stimulus money should go to pay for this. How many times does he have to hear that there are no unobligated funds in the stimulus bill? For any Nevadan to condemn the stimulus bill is to ignore what's going on in the State of Nevada.

Let me tell you what the stimulus bill did for us. It put \$700 billion into our education system. I'm not talking about only paying teachers and keeping them employed, I'm talking about the possibility of having to close schools. It put \$500 billion into Medicaid so that poor children and poor adults aren't going to be out on the streets dying for lack of medical care. Our unemployment compensation trust fund was broke. Zero. Zippo. We were able to put money into that.

And in addition to that, the construction projects that came directly from the stimulus package—not public but private contractors bidding on these projects and then hiring construction workers, the downtown transportation center, the park-and-ride in Centennial Hills, the Boulder Highway Transportation Center, and so many more came directly from this stimulus bill.

In addition to that, we had a middle-income tax cut, we had \$250 that went

to every Social Security recipient, \$250 went to every disabled veteran in Nevada. We welcomed this money. We needed this money. It kept us afloat.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, I've talked to several of our unemployed back home. And boy, I tell you, I empathize with them. It's a tough position. I just talked to an unemployed truck driver. His benefits are running out, but yet the trucks that have been idled over the last couple of years are yet to be back onto the road because this is a jobless recovery. Well, it's a very minimal recovery at best. But they aren't creating the jobs.

The public knows and we know that the stimulus hasn't worked. The business community feels that not only does the administration not understand business, but they are now attacking businesses, and the policies have created uncertainty where they won't create the jobs. That's the issue here. There's no jobs for them to go back to because of the policies that have been adopted in the last year and a half.

We should be growing the economy and getting these people back to work. That's what they want to do.

Now, again, I empathize. But the issue here is at a time when the majority is spending probably over \$4 trillion by the time this calendar year is done—and we're already at deficit spending of over a trillion dollars by June—the people are saying, Stop the spending. Stop the deficit spending.

And that's what the issue is here is the \$34 billion that's not paid for that's going to go to the deficit and ultimately to our national debt, and that's what the people are telling us to stop—even the unemployed truck driver that I talked to.

So, all we ask of the majority here, \$34 billion, you're telling me out of—well, we don't have a budget—but out of \$3.8 trillion you can't find \$34 billion to offset and keep your promises of PAYGO?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend where that trillion-dollar deficit came from is the \$1 trillion combined in Afghanistan and Iraq that we spent that's off budget, never accounted for, borrowed and spent by the Republicans in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, DAVID OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Talk, talk, talk. Blah, blah, blah. Yap, yap, yap. The country is sick of it all. They are sick of it all. Thank God finally there will be a cease-fire for the moment on the yap-yapping and the talk-talking while the Congress actually takes some action to restore unemployment benefits for nearly 85,000

people in my State and over 2½ million Americans who are caught up in the partisan delay game that was being played every day by some of our friends in the other body.

We're told, "Oh, we can't afford this." We hear that from the same people who blew up the economy in the first place with two wars paid for with borrowed money, with two tax cuts primarily aimed at the highest income people in this country paid for with borrowed money, and with years of economic policies that allowed Wall Street banks to morph into casinos because the referee was taken off the field.

And now they're crying crocodile tears at this late date about the cost of helping folks who are unemployed. And they want us to take actions in dealing with that that would further weaken the ability of the economy to grow.

And then some of them even have the gall to challenge the work ethic of Americans who are drawing unemployment. And some of them are off-the-wall enough to even believe that those folks would rather get a few hundred bucks a month rather than a steady paycheck. Well, if you believe that, I've got a lot of unemployed workers in Wisconsin I'd like to have you meet.

If you want, if you must, by all means debate economic theory, debate your academic theories, debate anything you want. But for God's sake remember that in this debate the people who are being affected are flesh-and-blood human beings. They are families who need our help. And it would be nice if we could quit yap-yapping long enough to provide that help.

Don't use the unemployed as cannon fodder in academic and political debates. For God's sake, remember there are simply people who need our help. Get it to them. We can have the phony political debates on another day.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I need to point out to my colleagues once more that when the Democrats took over the Congress in January of 2007, the deficit was about \$200 billion. There was a wonderful situation under Mr. Clinton, they like to point out, but that was because Republicans were in control of Congress and were controlling spending.

□ 1120

When the Democrats took control of Congress, that's when things started going downhill for this country. It's when unemployment started going up and bad things happened.

Let me say, Republicans have repeatedly called for cutting unspent stimulus spending to offset spending, but we're not alone.

The majority leader, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13 there's spending fatigue across the country and that, if we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act, they should be redirected to pay for new spending like this.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, hailed

amendments to the supplemental appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus bill.

In the other body, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same, pay for new spending by cutting stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, I enter the sources for my comments in my remarks for the RECORD.

Republicans have repeatedly called for cutting unspent stimulus spending to offset this spending. We are not alone. The Majority Leader, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13 there is "spending fatigue" across the country and that "if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act" that they should be redirected to pay for new spending like this. The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, hailed amendments to the supplemental appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus law. In the other body, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same—pay for new spending by cutting stimulus.

[From the Hill's On The Money, June 13, 2010]

HOYER: WHITE HOUSE SHOULD LOOK TO REDIRECT STIMULUS MONEY

(By Silla Brush)

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) wants the White House to look at unspent money from the 2009 stimulus package instead of asking Congress for a new fiscal package.

President Barack Obama on Saturday night wrote to congressional leaders urging them to pass legislation extending tax cuts and add new spending to prevent "hundreds of thousands" of teacher layoffs, among other cuts. Obama said that without such measures the economy could "slide backwards."

Hoyer said on ABC's "This Week" on Sunday that there is "spending fatigue" across the country and that he is encouraging the administration to look at last year's \$787 billion stimulus package to see if some money can be redirected.

"I have asked the White House to look at the package we already passed," Hoyer said. "I personally believe if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act we could apply to this immediate need."

Centrist Democrats in recent weeks have been more vocal about their concerns that new spending would lead to higher deficits and debt.

House Republican Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio) said: "To move without finding other offsets is irresponsible."

[From the Committee on Appropriations, July 1, 2010]

HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF THE 2010 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT: AMENDMENTS ON FULLY OFFSET EDUCATION AND OTHER FUNDING

(By Ellis Brachman and Jenilee Keefe Singer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The House of Representatives passed two amendments to H.R. 4899, the 2010 supplemental appropriations bill for efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Haiti and pressing domestic needs.

The Senate bill provides a total of \$45.5 billion in discretionary funding for FY 2010, of

which \$37.12 billion is provided for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill also provides \$5.1 billion for FEMA disaster relief, \$2.9 billion for Haiti, \$162 million for the Gulf Coast oil spill, and over \$600 million for other domestic needs in discretionary appropriations. Additionally, the bill includes \$13 billion in mandatory funding for Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange as requested by the President.

The House amendments add \$22.8 billion for important domestic needs, including \$10 billion for an Education Jobs Fund to help save 140,000 education jobs for the next school year, and funding for Pell Grants, summer youth jobs, the Pigford and Cobell settlements, border security, innovative technology energy loans, schools on military installations, additional Gulf Coast oil spill funding, emergency food assistance, a new soldier processing center at Fort Hood, and program integrity investments that are proven to produce 1½ times their cost in savings.

In order to hold the total amount to the President's requested level over a ten-year period, the amendments include a total of \$23.5 billion in offsets: \$11.7 billion in rescissions from programs that no longer require the funding, have sufficient funds on hand, or do not need the funding this year or next; \$4.7 billion in savings from changes to mandatory programs; and \$7.1 billion in increased revenues.

In total, the amendments save the Federal Government \$493 million over ten years compared to the President's request for Supplemental funding.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS IN THE HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Education Jobs: \$10 billion, fully offset, for an Education Jobs Fund to provide additional emergency support to local school districts to prevent impending layoffs. It is estimated that this fund will help keep 140,000 school employees on the job next year.

Process: The fund will be administered by the Department of Education. After reviewing State applications, the Department will make formula allocations to States based on total population and school age population. States will then distribute the funds to school districts through their respective funding formulas or based on each district's share of Title I funds. In the case that a Governor does not submit an approvable application for funds to the Department of Education, the bill directs the Secretary to bypass the State government and make awards directly to other entities within the State.

Requirements: The bill includes strict provisions to ensure that States use these funds only for preservation of jobs serving elementary and secondary education, and not to supplant State spending on education.

Amounts from the Education Jobs Fund may not be used for purposes such as equipment, utilities, renovation, or transportation.

The bill prohibits States from using any of these funds to add to "Rainy-Day Funds" or to pay off State debt.

In order to receive an Education Jobs Fund grant, each State must provide assurance that State spending for both K-12 and higher education (measured separately) in fiscal year 2011 will be at or above either:

1. the fiscal year 2009 level (in aggregate or per pupil);
2. the same percentage share of the total State budget as in fiscal year 2010, or;
3. for states demonstrating especially dire fiscal conditions, the 2006 fiscal year aggregate dollar level or percentage share.

NOTE: More stringent rules apply to the State of Texas.

Pell Grants: \$4.95 billion, fully offset, to address the current year shortfall in the Pell

Grant Program that was unanticipated last year. Over 8 million students received Pell grants this year.

Border Security: \$701 million to strengthen enforcement on the southern border, including:

\$208.4 million for 1,200 additional Border Patrol agents deployed between the ports of entry along the Southwest Border.

\$136 million to maintain current Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officer staffing levels and add 500 additional officers at ports of entry along the Southwest Border.

\$35.5 million for improved tactical communications on the Southwest Border, three permanent Border Patrol forward operating bases, and a surge of workforce integrity investigations designed to prevent corruption among CBP officers and agents.

\$50 million for Operation Stonegarden grants to support local law enforcement activities on the border.

\$32 million to procure two additional CBP unmanned aircraft systems.

\$30 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement activities directed at reducing the threat of narcotics smuggling and associated violence.

\$201 million for Justice Department programs, as requested.

Gulf Oil Spill: \$304 million for the Gulf Coast oil spill. The Senate bill carried \$162 million, including: \$83 million for unemployment assistance related to the oil spill and an oil spill relief employment program; \$7 million for NOAA oil spill response activities, including scientific investigations and sampling; \$14 million to respond to economic impacts on fishermen; \$10 million for Justice legal activities; \$5 million for economic recovery planning; and \$31 million for the Department of the Interior to conduct additional inspections and enforcement and to strengthen oversight and regulation and for the EPA to conduct a long-term risk study. The House amendment adds \$12 million for the newly created Presidential Commission investigating the spill; and \$130 million for an unemployment benefits program for the self-employed (i.e., fisherman) and for training and employment services.

Emergency Food Assistance: \$50 million for The Emergency Food Assistance Program for food purchases to distribute through local emergency food providers.

Schools on DoD Installations: \$163 million to improve the capacity and condition of elementary and secondary schools located on DoD installations.

Energy Loans: \$180 million to allow \$18 billion in innovative technology energy loans, split evenly between nuclear and renewable energy programs.

Fort Hood Soldier Processing Center: \$16.5 million for the replacement of the Soldier Readiness Processing Center at Fort Hood, Texas, the site of the 2009 shooting.

Program Integrity Funding: \$538 million to strengthen waste, fraud and abuse prevention and enforcement for Medicare, Medicaid and the IRS. Research shows that for every \$1.00 invested into identifying and eliminating waste, fraud and abuse in government spending, we get \$1.50 back.

Cobell and Pigford Settlements: \$4.6 billion to pay for settlement of both the Cobell and Pigford class action lawsuits. The Cobell settlement concerns the government's management and accounting for over 300,000 American Indians' trust accounts, and the Pigford settlement ends a decades old discrimination lawsuit brought by black farmers against USDA.

Summer Jobs: \$1 billion to allow local Workforce Investment Boards to expand successful summer jobs programs that were funded in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The funds would support over

350,000 jobs for youth ages 14 to 24 through summer employment programs. This age group has some of the highest unemployment levels—25% unemployment for those aged 16 to 19.

Modifications to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010: Makes two changes to Title IV, the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010," of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment (HIRE) Act. First, the amendment would distribute the Projects of National and Regional Significance (PNRS) and National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement (National Corridor) program funding so that each State receives a share equal to the greater of either (1) the amount of PNRS and National Corridor program funding that the State received under the HIRE Act or (2) the amount of PNRS and National Corridor funding that the State receives under this Act. The provision authorizes such sums as may be necessary from the Highway Trust Fund to provide these amounts. Second, the amendment would distribute "additional" highway formula funds (which the bill makes available in lieu of additional Congressionally-designated projects) among all of the highway formula programs rather than among just six formula programs.

UNDERLYING SENATE PROVISIONS

FEMA Disaster Relief: \$5.1 billion for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, as requested by the President and included in the Senate bill. The request is necessary to pay for known costs for past disasters, such as Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Ike, and Gustav, the Midwest floods of 2008, and the California wildfires and for needs that emerge from new disasters.

Veterans: \$13.377 billion in mandatory appropriations in 2010, as included in the Senate bill, for the payment of benefits to Vietnam veterans and their survivors for exposure to Agent Orange, which has been linked with Parkinson's disease, ischemic heart disease, and hairy cell/B cell leukemia. An estimated 86,069 people will be eligible to receive retroactive payments and 67,259 people will be eligible to receive new benefits.

Haiti: \$2.93 billion provided in the Senate bill for Haiti, \$130 million above the request.

Farm Loans: \$31.5 million, supporting \$950 million in farm loans, included in the Senate bill for the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to provide direct loans to family farmers who may not qualify for agricultural credit through other commercial institutions in the tight credit market. The funding provided in the FY 2010 appropriation bill was estimated to meet demand at the time the bill was passed, but demand for the farm ownership and operating loan programs continues to rise above historical levels due to the lack of availability of conventional credit.

Disaster Assistance: \$100 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding included in the Senate bill to help local communities devastated by flooding this year.

Mine Safety: \$22 million included in the Senate bill to reverse the growing backlog of mine safety enforcement cases while ensuring that the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) can complete 100% of its mandated mine inspections.

Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission: \$2 million included in the Senate bill to allow the Commission to investigate the causes of the recent financial crisis. The Commission is tasked with submitting its report by December, 2010.

Capitol Police: \$13 million included in the Senate bill for the ongoing acquisition and installation of a modern digital radio system because of known security threats.

Port of Guam: \$50 million, as requested, included in the Senate bill to improve and provide greater access to port facilities.

Highway Safety: \$15 million included in the Senate bill for additional studies of sudden acceleration and to administer fuel economy standards.

Rural Housing Loans: the Senate bill provides authority to continue making loans, and protects low-income borrowers from the loan fee increase.

Army Corps of Engineers: \$178 million included in the Senate bill to respond to natural disasters.

Mississippi River and Tributaries: \$18.6 million included in the Senate bill to respond to disasters.

Emergency Drought Relief: \$10 million included in the Senate bill to respond to droughts in the West.

Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies: \$20 million provided in the Senate bill for the Army Corps.

Fisheries Disasters: \$26 million provided in the Senate bill and offset by a NOAA rescission.

Economic Development Administration: \$49 million provided in the Senate bill.

Emergency Forest Restoration: \$18 million provided in the Senate bill.

Coast Guard: \$16 million provided in the Senate bill for aircraft replacement.

OFFSETS

The bill includes \$11.7 billion in rescissions from programs that no longer require the funding, have sufficient funds on hand, or do not need the funding this year or next. It also includes \$4.7 billion in savings from changes in mandatory programs. Rescissions include:

\$69.9 million in funds appropriated before 2008 to the Department of Agriculture.

\$122 million in funding provided to the Department of Agriculture for emergencies that have been completed.

\$487 million in Recovery Act and other funding provided to the Department of Agriculture for WIC.

\$27.3 million in emergency funding for the Farm Service Agency provided as early as 2004 that are no longer needed.

\$602 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce for broadband grants.

\$112 million in funding provided in the Recovery Act for digital television.

\$15 million in funding provided in the Recovery Act for NIST construction.

\$2 billion in funding appropriated as early as 2006 to the Defense Department.

\$500 million in funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for military construction projects that achieved bid savings.

\$262 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Department of Defense.

\$177 million in funding appropriated to the Defense Department for HMMWVs they no longer plan to purchase.

\$116 million appropriated for the Non-Line of Sight Launch System (NLOS-LS) which the Army has terminated.

\$100 million appropriated to the Army for Operations and Maintenance, because of slow execution of some programs within the account.

\$87 million appropriated for SINCGARS radios and other Army procurement programs that have not been spent as quickly as planned.

\$237 million in funds appropriated for Army Corps of Engineers projects now terminated or completed, or for projects that have not utilized allocated funding for several years.

\$800 million in funding provided to the Department of Education for new discretionary grant awards.

\$329 million in funding appropriated as early as 2009 to the Department of Energy, (including out-year savings).

\$18 million in funding appropriated as early as 2005 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

\$100 million in funding appropriated to the General Services Administration.

\$6 million in funds appropriated in 1995 to the Department of Health and Human Services.

\$2 billion in funding appropriated as early as 2004 to the Department of Health and Human Services for pandemic flu and procurement of new biological countermeasures.

\$200 million in funding for DHS border efforts currently frozen due to secretarial review.

\$36 million in funds appropriated in 2006 to FEMA.

\$7 million in funds appropriated in 2006 to the Coast Guard.

\$53.8 million in funds appropriated as early as 2007 for research in DHS' Domestic Nuclear Detection office.

\$6.6 million in funds appropriated in 2007 to the Transportation Security Administration.

\$80 million in Recovery Act funding appropriated to the Department of Interior, EPA, and Forest Service.

\$33 million in funding provided in 1997 and 2004 to the National Park Service and the Fish & Wildlife Service.

\$2.7 million in funds appropriated in 2010 to the Judiciary.

\$11 million in funds appropriated in 1989 to the Federal Highway Administration.

\$8 million in funds appropriated in 2004 and 2006 to the Federal Aviation Administration.

\$112 million in funds appropriated in 2008 for Hurricanes Ike and Gustav and Midwest Floods.

\$400 million in funds appropriated in 2008 for CDBG for Hurricane Katrina.

\$2.2 billion in highway contract authority.

\$44 million in unused Recovery Act funding from the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program (aka Cash for Clunkers).

\$40 million in Recovery Act funding appropriated to the State Department.

\$150 million in funding appropriated for the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

\$70 million in funding appropriated to the Department of State and USAID for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative.

\$6 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Department of Veterans Affairs for which the purpose has been completed.

\$5 million in funding appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Iran Sanctions: The House amendment prohibits funding from being provided for any new contract unless the contractor has certified that it, and any entities it controls, does not engage in activity that could be sanctioned under section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

No Fly List: The Senate bill requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to require commercial foreign air carriers to check the list of individuals TSA has prohibited from flying no later than 30 minutes after the list has been updated.

High-Value Detainee Interrogations: The Senate bill requires the FBI to submit the High-Value Detainee Interrogation procedures, and any updates to those procedures, to the Congress within 30 days.

Defense Jobs Estimates: The House amendment requires an assessment of the number of jobs and costs associated with new major defense acquisitions planned for 2011.

Preserving Access to Affordable Generic Drugs: The House amendment includes a provision to strengthen the Federal Trade Commission's ability to restrict lucrative "pay

for delay" payments by brand-name drug manufacturers to their generic competitors to delay the manufacture and marketing of more affordable generic drugs to consumers. In 2009, an FTC study found that a ban on these lucrative sweetheart drug industry deals would save American consumers \$35 billion over 10 years. CBO estimates that with the provision in this bill, the federal government will save more than \$2.4 billion over 10 years in lower drug costs for Medicare, Medicaid, military and veterans' health programs.

Medicaid AMP Computation: The House amendment includes a provision to clarify the calculation of the "Average Manufacturer Price" (AMP), which determines the amount of manufacturer rebates to the federal government for outpatient drugs purchased by the Medicaid program. This technical correction to the health care reform bill affects certain injectable, infusible, and inhalation drugs. It will save the American taxpayers \$2.1 billion over 10 years.

Public Safety Collective Bargaining: The House amendment guarantees collective bargaining rights for the nation's first responders employed by States and localities. Under the language, states would administer and enforce their own labor laws, while the Federal Labor Relations Authority would step in only where such laws do not exist or do not meet minimum standards. The language prohibits public safety officers from engaging in a lockout, sickout, work slowdown, strike, or any other organized job action that will disrupt the delivery of emergency services.

FHA Loan Authority: The House amendment increases the loan commitment authority for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to insure mortgages for multifamily housing, hospitals and health care facilities. This increase in authority is necessary in order to avoid a disruption or suspension in the financing of these facilities.

GRAT Minimum Term: Includes the President's 2011 Budget proposal to require a minimum 10-year term and other changes to Grantor retained annuity trusts ("GRATs"). GRATs allow taxpayers to structure a transfer of assets to avoid gift taxes. As a result, taxpayer would be required to take on greater risk in order to take advantage of the gift tax benefits of using a GRAT. This provision is estimated to raise \$5.297 billion over 10 years.

Crude Tall Oil: Limits eligibility for the cellulosic biofuel tax credit, which was created to encourage the development of new production capacity for biofuels that are not derived from food sources, to fuels that are not highly corrosive (i.e., fuels that could be used in a car engine or in a home heating application). The change would prevent taxpayers from claiming the credit for production of processed fuels that are highly corrosive, such as crude tall oil (a waste by-product of the paper manufacturing process). This proposal is estimated to raise \$1.849 billion over 10 years.

[From the Hill's On The Money] HOUSE DEMOCRATS TO USE UNSPENT STIMULUS MONEY FOR TEACHERS (By Walter Alarkon)

House Democrats will try to use money from their \$862 billion stimulus to help pay for education spending in a supplemental appropriations bill.

The package crafted by House Appropriations Committee Chairman David Obey (D-Wis.) would include \$10 billion to help states and local governments avoid teacher layoffs, \$5 billion for Pell Grant funding and \$701 million to increase security at the Mexican border.

House leaders will try this week to attach the measure as an amendment to a spending

bill already passed by the Senate that provides \$37 billion for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Obeys's \$11.7 billion domestic spending package wouldn't add to the \$13 trillion debt. It would be offset by redirecting money in the stimulus and with other spending cuts.

About \$1.6 billion in stimulus money that would have gone to the departments of State, Defense, Interior, Veterans Affairs, Agriculture and Commerce and for the "Cash for Clunkers automobile trade-in program will be used as an offset in the supplemental bill.

Obeys's decision to offset the spending with stimulus funds is aimed at shoring up support for the supplemental spending bill. Both Republicans and centrist Democrats have opposed more deficit spending to help boost the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The jobless need jobs. Why is it that the majority doesn't understand that? We do not help the unemployed by making more of them.

The gentleman from Florida asked an important question: What would have happened without all of the trillions of dollars of stimulus spending? It's becoming increasingly clear what would have happened: a normal V-shaped recovery.

In every past economic recession, save one, the greater the economic contraction, the more dramatic has been the following recovery. That one exception was the recession of 1929 when Keynesian economics had come into vogue. Herbert Hoover responded to that recession by enacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that was a tax on tens of thousands of imported products. He increased Federal spending 60 percent in 4 years. He increased the Federal income tax rate from 25 to 63 percent. These were policies that were extended and expanded under Franklin Roosevelt, and as Roosevelt's own Treasury Secretary admitted in 1939, it did not work.

The gentleman's history is simply wrong. The Depression ended and the great postwar economic boom began in 1946. You will find that, in 1946, Democrat Harry Truman cut Federal spending dramatically. In 1946, he cut the Federal budget from \$80 billion down to \$35 billion. He fired 10 million Federal employees. It was called demobilization, and the result was the entire postwar economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it's said that those who don't learn from history are bound to repeat it. I fear that the majority party is repeating a failed history of economic contraction at just a time when we need pro-growth policies.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague and fellow Floridian, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, and my constituents are appalled, at the Repub-

licans' disrespect and coldheartedness when it comes to extending unemployment benefits for out-of-work Americans. Some Republican Members of Congress and candidates in their party have suggested that unemployment insurance makes Americans too lazy to work. One Republican Member of the House even asked, "Is the government now creating hobos?"

Maybe my Republican colleagues don't understand how unemployment compensation works. You only qualify for unemployment if you were employed. Far from being a handout to someone who doesn't want to work, unemployment benefits are specifically designed for people who want to work but who can't currently find work.

The Bush recession drove our economy off a cliff creating the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression. As a result, millions of Americans lost their jobs. Nearly 800,000 Americans lost their jobs in the last month of the Bush administration alone. Those are the facts.

Now we are beginning to recover from this near economic collapse. We've seen steady economic growth, including six straight months of private sector job growth, but there are still five unemployed Americans looking for work for every one job opening available.

The continued Republican opposition to helping out-of-work Americans is preposterous. It flies in the face of history. Since 1959, Congress has never let extended unemployment benefits expire when unemployment is over 7.2 percent.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that we can't afford to help unemployed Americans, but where were they when they ran up the deficit by passing tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans? Where were they when, year after year, President Bush's budget did not include the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, analysis from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office finds that extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy. Moreover, economists agree that extending these benefits will create jobs and decrease the chances of slipping into a double-dip recession. So not only is it the right thing to do to help people who are temporarily out of work, it is also one of the best ways to stimulate local economies, from the very smallest towns to the very biggest cities.

Let's do the right thing. Let's pass extended unemployment benefits.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

You know, I've often said that being here in Washington is like being Alice in Wonderland. I didn't know that there are a lot of other people who feel the same way.

I did want to ask my colleague from Massachusetts who made the contention that if we get \$1.90 back for every

dollar we spend, we don't understand why the Democrats are stopping at spending \$34 billion for these unemployment benefits. But I do want to come back to the issue of being Alice in Wonderland.

And recently, there have been several articles that have been published that have talked about this being Alice in Wonderland and the tea party, and I would like to quote from one of those articles from The Washington Times this Monday.

"A recent CBS Poll reports that 74 percent of the population thinks the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus package either hurt or had no impact on the economy. Simply put, that means three-fourths of the American people think the stimulus package was a \$1 trillion waste of money. The same poll reports that 2.5 times as many people think the health care reform bill signed into law by Democrats will hurt them (33 percent) rather than help them (13 percent)."

It goes on to say, "Many Americans are seized with fear as what might normally be a benign, lame-duck session of Congress looms in November."

Another quote: "In Lewis Carroll's story, Alice finds herself in a bizarre, nightmarish world where the basic laws of logic no longer apply and familiar beings take on strange, unreasoning personas. More and more, many Americans view our progressive leaders on Capitol Hill and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue as the insane hosts of an ongoing Washington-style mad tea party."

I think that's what many Americans feel. I agree with them. That is what we are hearing when we go home to our districts and talk to the people there. They're seeing Washington as Wonderland and that there is a mad tea party going on.

I would like to also point out that there's another article which came out in Bloomberg Opinion which talks about the discrepancy in the job numbers that have come out.

Mr. Speaker, we know Americans are hurting. We know there's a lot of unemployment and we're sympathetic, but this is not the right way to go.

[From the Washington Times, July 19, 2010]

A TALE OF TWO TEA PARTIES

(By Doug Mainwaring)

Two Tea Parties grip the nation in two very different ways. The first is the Tea Party movement, which traces its origins to a watershed historic event as its members attempt to bring sanity and sustainability back to government. The second finds its origins in literature—Lewis Carroll's "The Adventures of Alice in Wonderland"—and is descriptive of the surreal governance of the progressives in the White House and Congress as they continue their push toward governmental insanity and unsustainability. Like matter and antimatter, positive and negative charges, they are set in polar opposition to each other.

In Lewis Carroll's story, Alice finds herself in a bizarre, nightmarish world where the basic laws of logic no longer apply and familiar beings take on strange, unreasoning personas. More and more, many Americans

view our progressive leaders on Capitol Hill and at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. as the insane hosts of an ongoing Washington-style mad tea party. Those leaders act not just counterintuitively, they act outside the bounds of logic, reason and historic precedent that normally tether this country to safety. They behave as political elites who think they know better than the American public what's best. They are ludicrously out of touch.

The madness of this Washington tea party is displayed in myriad ways, but most profoundly in the nearly limitless demonstrations of stunning disconnect between the political elites and the American people. Congressional approval hovers around 20 percent, while disapproval is around 70 percent. The president's approval rating has been in decline for a long time, now at about 45 percent and sinking. Despite the fact that a majority in this country disapprove of the work being done by the political class, the political elites continue to pass gigantic, overreaching, outrageously expensive legislation.

A Rasmussen survey released on Friday finds that 59 percent of likely voters are embarrassed by the nation's political class and its behavior while just 23 percent are not. A stunning 64 percent see the political class as a bigger threat to our nation than legislation such as Arizona's new immigration law. Just 20 percent say the opposite. In general, the nation sees the political class as both an embarrassment and, in some ways, a threat by about a 3-1 margin.

From the point of view of the ruling political class, it has racked up tremendous achievements: the stimulus package, health care reform, education reform, Wall Street reform and so on. While the elites lift their champagne glasses to toast themselves, outside the Beltway, no one is popping corks.

Most of the country looks on with jaws dropped, wondering: What are you folks on Capitol Hill thinking? Twenty-four-hundred pages of unintelligible health care reform and another 2,300 pages of unintelligible financial reform signed into law. Stacked together, they create a legislative Tower of Babel. How dare you pass this massive legislation while you lack the confidence of the American people by a 7-2 margin?

Undaunted, their mad tea party continues.

A recent CBS Poll reports that 74 percent of the population thinks the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus package either hurt or had no impact on the economy. Simply put, that means three-fourths of the American people think the stimulus package was a \$1 trillion waste of money. The same poll reports that 2.5 times as many people think the health care reform bill signed into law by Democrats will hurt them (33 percent) rather than help them (13 percent).

Many Americans are seized with fear as what might normally be a benign, lame-duck session of Congress looms in November. Will this be used as a window of opportunity for progressives to pass more unwanted legislation? "Cap and trade"? Card check? This could be their intention.

Our progressive leaders don't get it, and what's more, they don't care. They don't understand how starkly different, how irrational and just how unhinged they appear to folks outside the Beltway. While Lewis Carroll's mad tea party is literary fantasy, sadly, the progressives' mad tea party in Washington is very real.

Robert Weissberg offered his view in the *American Thinker* on April 29: "I finally realized that the Obama administration and its congressional collaborators almost resemble a foreign occupying force, a coterie of politically and culturally non-indigenous leaders whose rule contravenes local values rooted in our national tradition. It is as if the

United States has been occupied by a foreign power, and this transcends policy objections."

Dorothy Rabinowitz, writing in the *Wall Street Journal* a few weeks later on June 9, shares a similar sentiment: "A great part of America now understands that this president's sense of identification lies elsewhere and is in profound ways unlike theirs. He is hard put to sound convincingly like the leader of the nation, because he is, at heart and by instinct, the voice mainly of his ideological class. He is the alien in the White House. . . ."

Interestingly, the progressives' mad tea party in Washington is what has given rise to the august Tea Party movement. Washington leadership has abandoned the venerable, common-sense, salt-of-the-earth center and right of our nation. The movement has emerged to fill the gaping void in center-right leadership to stem the tide of this Washington madness. Republican leaders have been either clueless or unwilling to lead bravely and skillfully. When Republicans controlled both houses of Congress, they also spent profligately. With such a huge vacuum of leadership in Washington, the Tea Party movement has burst forth to lead the way.

The people at this country's admirable, sustaining center have been ignored, trampled and tyrannized for too long. They have been marginalized through political correctness and the constant motion of the dividing line between progressivism and conservatism far to the left. We now live in an upside-down, Alice-in-Wonderland, house-of-mirrors world where the most basic of mainstream American sensibilities are considered to be radical right-wing thought. This has led Americans from sea to shining sea to announce: Enough is enough.

Tea Partiers seek to end the madness in Washington and establish fiscal sanity and sound, reasonable, constitutionally limited government.

[From the Bloomberg Opinion, July 18, 2010]

OBAMA OMITTS JOBS KILLED OR THWARTED
FROM TALLY

(By Caroline Baum)

Can you believe they're still touting that silly metric?

When I heard last week that the White House would be announcing the number of "jobs created or saved" as a result of the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, my first reaction was embarrassment.

Imagine how Christina Romer must feel. The chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors was dressed in a cheery, salmon-colored jacket, a complement to the upbeat news she had to deliver on July 14. The \$787 billion stimulus enacted in February 2009, which subsequently grew to \$862 billion, increased gross domestic product by 2.7 percent to 3.4 percent relative to where it would have been, and added anywhere from 2.5 million to 3.6 million jobs compared with an ex-stimulus baseline.

"By this estimate, the Recovery Act has met the president's goal of saving or creating 3.5 million jobs—two quarters earlier than anticipated," Romer said with a straight face. (More than 2.5 million non-farm jobs have been lost since ARRA was enacted in February 2009, all of them in the private sector, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

How does the CEA arrive at these numbers? It uses two methods, Romer said. The first is a standard macroeconomic forecasting model that estimates the multiplier effect of fiscal policy. (The government's spending is someone else's income.) The second method is statistical, using previous relationships between GDP and employment to project future behavior.

MODEL IMPERFECTION

These numbers might just as well have been pulled out of a hat. Recall that it was the same model and method the administration used in January 2009 to predict an unemployment rate of 7 percent in the fourth quarter of 2010 with the enactment of the fiscal stimulus and 8.8 percent without. The unemployment rate now stands at 9.5 percent.

This same model convinced policy makers that the subprime crisis was contained, encouraged the rating companies to slap AAA ratings on collateralized garbage, and led banks to believe they had adequately managed their risks and reserved for potential losses.

Econometric models rely on the assumption that \$1 of government spending generates more than \$1 of GDP, the so-called multiplier effect. There is no allowance for the negative multiplier on the other side.

Sure the government can spend money and generate GDP growth in the short run: Government spending is a component of GDP!

What it giveth it taketh away from the private sector via taxation or borrowing. Every dollar the government spends is a dollar the private sector doesn't spend, an investment it doesn't make, a job it doesn't create. This is what is unseen, as Frederic Bastiat explained in an 1850 essay.

HIRING DISINCENTIVES

"If the administration wants to take credit for 'jobs created or saved,' it should also accept responsibility for 'jobs destroyed or prevented,'" said Bill Dunkelberg, chief economist at the National Federation of Independent Business.

Ignoring the flaws in the stimulus for the moment, Congress raised the hurdle for hiring entry-level workers when it refused to delay the third step in a three-stage minimum wage increase last year. And the Department of Labor cracked down on unpaid internships, outlining six criteria that businesses had to satisfy in order to hire someone willing and able to work for nothing to get the experience.

For example, the employer must derive "no immediate advantage from the activities of the trainees, and on occasion the employer's operations may actually be impeded."

You can't make this stuff up.

RECESSION'S ADVANTAGE

At the White House briefing last week, Romer touted the leveraging of public investment with private funds, with \$1 of Recovery Act funds partnering with \$3 of outside spending. Romer said this public spending "saved or created 800,000 jobs" in the second quarter alone.

Once again, what would have happened in the absence of the government's targeted intervention?

According to a June 2009 study by the Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, Missouri, well over half of the companies on the Fortune 500 list, and almost half of the fastest growing companies in America, were started during a recession or bear market. Dunkelberg calls this phenomenon "negative push starts." People might not be willing to quit their jobs, but if they get laid off during a recession and were thinking about starting a business, they might seize the day, he said.

"When people ask me when the best time to start a company is, I tell them the day before the recession ends," Dunkelberg said. "They can do it on the cheap, and the next day you get cash flow."

MODEL THAT!

What's more, firms less than five years old are responsible for all of the net new jobs created in the U.S., the Kauffman study found. Job creation by start-ups is more stable, less sensitive to the business cycle.

So, if the goal is to create more jobs, and start-ups are the ones that create them, why is the Obama administration partnering up with existing firms?

"Job-creation policies aimed at luring larger, established employers will inevitably fail," said Tim Kane, Kauffman Foundation senior fellow in research and policy and author of a follow-up study released this month.

Not to worry. The White House has a model that turns failure into success.

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

A little while ago, George Bush said this. Several months after taking office, he learned that his budgets had already erased the previous administration's huge surplus that was paying off our country's debt at a rapid rate and had instead forced the country to start borrowing heavily again. Bush said, The huge deficit was incredibly positive news because it will create a fiscal straitjacket for Congress.

□ 1130

That's right, massive deficits were incredibly positive news.

Mr. Speaker, I got a little tired of hearing our colleagues saying what the Democrats haven't done. Let me tell you what we have done.

We have done the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We have done the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act. We have done health insurance reform, Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibilities Act. The Cash for Clunkers Program alone spurred the sale of 700,000 vehicles.

We have done the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act that helped create 300,000 jobs. When they talk in terms of the stimulus, the teachers, the police officers and the firefighters, when you ask them whether or not their jobs were saved, I guarantee you they will give you an answer.

We did Wall Street reform passed by the House, American Worker, State, and Business Relief Act passed by the House and Senate, Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Tax Act passed by the House. For those on the other side who argue that there haven't been any tax cuts, there have been tax cuts, but those tax cuts were for middle class Americans, 93 percent of whom received the tax cut. We have done the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act passed by the House, and it died over there in the Senate, and that's regrettable and foolish.

We have done Jobs for Main Street Act, passed by the House. What's next? Small business lending, clean energy jobs and the COMPETES Act. I can assure you, we have done a lot and have a lot more to do and many of the things that I just spoke of create jobs.

My colleagues see this legislation as a handout or a luxury, but to the millions who are depending on us to act, the extension of unemployment benefits will make the difference between

whether they can put food on the table, pay their rent, and just get by.

Years of bad economic and fiscal policies have brought us to our present situation, and there is no switch we can throw to provide an instant fix. In my home State of Florida, 147,000 individuals will run out of unemployment benefits.

I haven't met these people, but I read about their plight, people like Joan McCammon of Kissimmee, a 50-year-old former administrative assistant who has been out of work for over a year. Though she and her husband tried to be prepared without this assistance, they will have to dip into their retirement savings just to make ends meet.

She is not much different from Pandora Evans of Fort Pierce in my congressional district who has been unemployed for almost 2 years after losing her job at a service station. Her benefits have run out and her bills piled up to the point she may soon be homeless.

And there is Joe Becker of Jupiter, Florida, who has applied for nearly 400 jobs, has put himself through additional training and is still unable to find work.

These are only three of the 3.2 million Americans who stand to lose unemployment compensation if we do not act positively. This is not mere charity for them.

I urge my colleagues to pass this much-needed extension and urge them to support this rule. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1550 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1469, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

YEAS—237

Ackerman	Boucher	Clyburn
Altmire	Boyd	Cohen
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Connolly (VA)
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Conyers
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Baldwin	Butterfield	Costa
Barrow	Capps	Costello
Bean	Cardoza	Courtney
Becerra	Carnahan	Critz
Berkley	Carney	Crowley
Berman	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Berry	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Dahlkemper
Bishop (NY)	Childers	Davis (AL)
Blumenauer	Chu	Davis (CA)
Bocchieri	Clarke	Davis (IL)
Boren	Clay	Davis (TN)
Boswell	Cleaver	DeFazio

DeGette	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rangel
Delahunt	Kissell	Reyes
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Richardson
Deutch	Kosmas	Rodriguez
Dicks	Kratovil	Ross
Dingell	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Doggett	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Driehaus	Larson (CT)	Rush
Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Edwards (TX)	Levin	Salazar
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Linda T.
Ellison	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellsworth	Loebach	Sarbanes
Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lowey	Schauer
Etheridge	Lujan	Schiff
Farr	Lynch	Schrader
Fattah	Maffei	Schwartz
Filner	Markey (MA)	Scott (GA)
Foster	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Serrano
Fudge	Matsui	Sestak
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Gonzalez	McCollum	Sherman
Gordon (TN)	McDermott	Sires
Grayson	McGovern	Skelton
Green, Al	McIntyre	Slaughter
Green, Gene	McMahon	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McNerney	Snyder
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Space
Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)	Speier
Halvorson	Melancon	Spratt
Hare	Michaud	Stark
Harman	Miller (NC)	Stupak
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Sutton
Heinrich	Mollohan	Tanner
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Teague
Himes	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hinchey	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)	Tierney
Hirono	Nadler (NY)	Tonko
Holden	Napolitano	Towns
Holt	Neal (MA)	Tsongas
Honda	Oberstar	Van Hollen
Hoyer	Obey	Velázquez
Inslie	Olver	Visclosky
Israel	Owens	Walz
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Schultz
(TX)	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Watson
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Watt
Kagen	Perriello	Waxman
Kanjorski	Peters	Weiner
Kaptur	Peterson	Welch
Kennedy	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (OH)
Kildee	Polis (CO)	Woolsey
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomeroy	Wu
Kilroy	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Kind	Rahall	

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Cao	Graves (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Capito	Graves (MO)
Akin	Carter	Griffith
Alexander	Cassidy	Guthrie
Austria	Castle	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Chaffetz	Harper
Bachus	Coble	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Coffman (CO)	Heller
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Hensarling
Bartlett	Conaway	Herger
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Hill
Biggart	Culberson	Hunter
Blibray	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Bilirakis	Dent	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Blunt	Djou	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Dreier	Jones
Bonner	Duncan	Jordan (OH)
Bono Mack	Emerson	King (IA)
Boozman	Flake	Kingston
Boustany	Fleming	Kirk
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Bright	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Brown (GA)	Fox	Lance
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Ginny	Galleghy	Latta
Buchanan	Garrett (NJ)	Lee (NY)
Burgess	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Giffords	Linder
Buyer	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Calvert	Gohmert	Lucas
Camp	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Campbell	Granger	Lummis

Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye

Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt

Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Cantor
Capuano
Doyle
Fallin
Hodes

Hoekstra
King (NY)
Maloney
Murphy, Patrick
Ortiz

Quigley
Tiahrt
Titus
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1200

Messrs. HELLER, CARTER, and BAIRD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

CHILD PROTECTION
IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 4, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—413

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman

Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)

Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter

Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich

Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hersteth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler

Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor

Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—4

Broun (GA)
Flake

Graves (GA)
Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX)
Capuano
Doyle
Fallin
Hodes

Hoekstra
King (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Ortiz
Quigley

Rush
Snyder
Tiahrt
Wamp
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1212

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5720

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 5720.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1550, I call up the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and I 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 to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—