

have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5885.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5893, INVESTING IN AMERICAN JOBS AND CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1568 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1568

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5893) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create jobs through increased investment in infrastructure, to eliminate loopholes which encourage companies to move operations offshore, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the calendar day of August 1, 2010.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to

insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this resolution provides a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 5893, the Investing in American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI and against the bill, itself. The rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered, without intervening motion, except 1 hour of debate for the Ways and Means Committee and one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule also provides same-day authority for a resolution reported from the Rules Committee through Sunday, August 1, 2010.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5893, the Investing in American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010, creates and protects American jobs through increased investment in infrastructure and by closing tax loopholes that enable companies to move their operations offshore. This is another piece of legislation to add to the long list of bills that Democrats have passed this Congress to spur opportunities to support American jobs, American manufacturing, and American families. Democrats are helping Americans dig out of the worst recession in decades. We are making steady, albeit slow—too slow for me—gains in our economy. The struggle is not over, but we are on the right path.

Madam Speaker, this legislation funds the highly successful Build America Bonds program, the Recovery Zone Bonds, the Emergency State Jobs Assistance program, and it closes unfair tax loopholes that allow corporations to send American jobs overseas. This bill provides critical funding for infrastructure investment that will create jobs here in the United States and will put money in the pockets of people who badly need it.

□ 1150

And yet, still, the Republicans are against it.

Madam Speaker, it seems every other day around here we have to drag our Republican colleagues kicking and screaming to the House floor to try to help hardworking Americans, and they continue to say "no."

Every other day we have to try to persuade our friends on the other side of the aisle that it's not crazy for the American Government to invest in the American economy to benefit the American people.

Every other day we have to remonstrate the same old arguments from the Republicans about spending and deficits and taxes and the bad old government stifling our economic recovery.

I'll remind this body that the Republicans were against the largest stimulus in history, which was not large enough for me and some of us in this body. But they were against this stimulus, an effort that demonstrably has saved American jobs.

And I'll remind this body that 95 percent of the Republicans in this House have signed a pledge to protect tax breaks for companies that ship American jobs overseas.

And I'll remind this body that Republicans have consistently voted against job creation and economic development measures that directly benefit, directly benefit hardworking Americans trying to secure enough income to feed their families and keep their homes.

Every single time Democrats try to pass essential legislation in this body, and the other body, Republicans complain about the numbers. If it's spending on investments in our economy, Republicans complain the numbers are too high. But if it's spending on tax cuts for the extremely 1 percent wealthiest of Americans, the Republicans complain the numbers are too low.

Well, here's a number and a letter we should be mindful of: \$2.2 trillion, and the letter D: D is the grade given to America's infrastructure by the American Society of Engineers in 2009.

And \$2.2 trillion is the amount the American Society of Engineers estimates the United States needs to spend over the next 5 years to repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, in recent years we've seen levees fail, bridges collapse. As a matter of fact, we saw a levee fail last week in Iowa. Bridges collapsed. I asked one of our colleagues yesterday that appeared before the Rules Committee, how did he feel when the bridge collapsed in Minnesota. He referenced it as a national tragedy, as all of us do and did.

But when I came to this Congress in 1992, there were 14,000 bridges that were in disrepair in the United States of America. And I dare say that we have not even come close and, likely, there are many more. And what I said to him was, I wanted his daughter, who I know, to travel on a safe bridge, and I wanted my children and all the children of all Americans, when they cross a bridge, to know that that bridge is safe.

Millions of tons of hazardous waste have wrecked fragile ecosystems, and billions of gallons of wastewater have poured from burst pipes into our rivers and streams, and we saw that happen this week in America.

Beyond the disasters is the steadily rising gridlock on our highways, roads, airports and rails, the constant erosion of our water systems. Right here in the metropolitan Washington area people are on boil water advisories and limited uses, including for showers.

Declining park land in urban areas and maintenance backlogs in our schools amounting to hundreds of billions of dollars.

Budget cuts are not going to repair bridges, replace water treatment facilities or maintain classrooms. State and local governments desperately need Federal funding to engage American small businesses and put people to work.

This legislation provides billions of dollars in infrastructure bonds and other supports so communities can hire the necessary workers to make sure that, while we are arguing about process here, whether or not it's a closed rule or an open rule, arguing process in the Rules Committee, more dams don't fail. That's what we want to make sure that does not happen.

Dollars that go to infrastructure projects get returned to the economy at higher rates. Infrastructure spending is impactful, essential, and worthwhile, pumping in cash that goes right to the American worker.

The funding in this legislation is paid for. It does not add to the deficit. It is revenue neutral, and there is no wasteful spending in here.

What Republicans argue is wasteful, I say, is essential to preventing millions of Americans from falling into destitution. For every one job opening in our great country, there are five applicants. Unemployment remains unbearably high, and all economists indicate that it is going to remain that way for some time to come.

I dare say that what America needs to understand, and what my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle continue to say, is that it happened on this President's watch, or it happened on that President's watch. The real truth is the economy in this country transitioned, as well as globally, over about a 45-year period of time. I'll get to that one day, so as how there's a better understanding than all of this finger-pointing about who caused this deficit.

And I certainly hope we have a debate about how much the war in Iraq and Afghanistan cost. I can tell you now it's about \$1 trillion. And guess what our deficit is? Just a little more than \$1 trillion.

Madam Speaker, it's far past time to pass this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this rule and on the final passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time, and I appreciate very much and accept his comments, in particular about how we are concerned personally for each other's children and each other's family. I believe that is absolutely true. And I appreciate the comments that the gentleman made yesterday in Rules in that respect, and also here.

Madam Speaker, Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines outrageous as "going beyond all standards of what is right or decent," "deficient in propriety or good taste."

The outrageous rule before us today represents a sickening embarrassment for this institution that the American people have charged with the responsibility to provide effective solutions to their real problems.

Unfortunately, the ruling liberal Democrat majority has taken this opportunity to devise a cynical plot to ram through this misguided, partisan legislation which has had no committee consideration, no CBO cost estimate, and was sprung on the minority party only 90 minutes before its consideration in the Rules Committee yesterday. Despite these atrocities, the ruling liberal Democrats couldn't bring themselves to allow for any amendments, choosing instead to present us with this closed rule containing same-day "martial-law" authority through Sunday.

Although we've grown accustomed to this type of process under the reign of the current liberal Democrat majority, their arrogance and contempt for institutional integrity never ceases to shock and amaze us.

This is a far cry from 2006 when then-minority leader NANCY PELOSI promised regular order for legislation in her "New Direction for America."

At that time she pledged that bills should be developed following full hearings and open subcommittee and committee mark ups with appropriate referrals to other committees.

Members should have at least 24 hours to examine a bill prior to consideration at the subcommittee level. Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

□ 1200

The third point she made, "Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bill and conference report text prior to floor consideration. Rules governing floor debate must be reported before 10 p.m. for a bill to be considered the following day."

"Should," I guess, is the operative word here, Madam Speaker. Speaker PELOSI could say she didn't promise, she just said "should." How times have changed. With hypocrisy like this, it's no wonder the American people are shaking their heads watching the shenanigans of this most leftist, liberal, elitist, arrogant, and out of touch Democrat regime in the history of our great Nation.

The liberals will undoubtedly excuse their shameful actions today by blaming George Bush, as they always do, and relate their actions to certain instances under Republican congressional leadership, but it makes no sense to criticize in one breath and emulate in another what they identify as the sins of the past.

My friend across the aisle talked about tax cuts and how Republicans love tax cuts but don't want investments. I want to point out to my colleague that in the 2001 tax cuts which

were passed, there were many Democrats who voted for those tax cuts, both on the House and Senate side. The same thing with the 2003 tax cuts. Democrats supported those. And we were very grateful for that. In the final consideration of the Iraq war authorization, many Democrats supported that also. So we do have revisionist history, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to insert into the RECORD the record of the votes on those various items.

Let's be clear about what this bill does, Mr. Speaker. We are spending more of taxpayers' money on plans that will kill private-sector jobs. We know we have the largest deficit in history, and we need to stop this spending. Let me say to you again, there are four parts to this bill. Let me mention what they are in terms the American people can understand.

Number one, it provides for up to \$5 billion for the Welfare Emergency Fund, doubling a new welfare program that Democrats created in the 2009 stimulus. The bill has \$31.8 billion in revenue increases that will hurt an already weakened economy and could threaten our international competitiveness. The bill spends \$25.6 billion on State infrastructure programs while abandoning small businesses, and will not create the private-sector jobs that we need. Also, we know that this bill wouldn't be needed at all if the stimulus that our friends tout so much had not been the huge failure that it has been and had actually worked.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject this bill so we can begin to restore a semblance of sanity in this noble institution.

INITIAL CONSIDERATION OF 2001 TAX CUTS H.R. 1836, 107TH CONGRESS

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT (EGTRRA)—P.L. 107-16, (16 MAY 2001)

Question: On Passage: Yea-and-Nay.
Bill title: Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Republican	216			4
Democratic	13	196		1
Independent	1			
Totals	230	197		5

13 House Democratic Representatives voting aye: Abercrombie, Bishop, Clement, Condit, Cramer, Gordon, Hall (TX), John, Lucas (KY), Maloney (CT), McIntyre, Shows, and Traficante.

Senate Vote Counts: Yeas 62, Nays 38

12 Senators voting yea: Baucus (D-MT), Breaux (D-LA), Carnahan (D-MO), Cleland (D-GA), Feinstein (D-CA), Johnson (D-SD), Kohl (D-WI), Landrieu (D-LA), Lincoln (D-AR), Miller (D-GA), Nelson (D-NE), Torricelli (D-NJ).

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF 2001 TAX CUTS—H.R. 1836 (26 MAY 2001)

Question: On Agreeing to the Conference Report.

Bill Title: Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Republican	211			10

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Democratic	28	153		29
Independent	1	1		
Totals	240	154		39

28 House Democratic Representatives voting aye: Abercrombie, Barcia, Berkley, Capps, Carson (OK), Clement, Condit, Cramer, Dooley, Gordon, Hall (TX), Hooley, Israel, John, Larsen (WA), Lucas (KY), Matheson, McCarthy (NY), Moore, Peterson (MN), Roemer, Ross, Sandlin, Schiff, Shows, Tauscher, Traficant, and Turner.

Senate Vote Counts: Yeas 58, Nays 33, Present 2, Not Voting 7

11 Democratic Senators voting aye: Breaux (D-LA), Carnahan (D-MO), Cleland (D-GA), Feinstein (D-CA), Johnson (D-SD), Kohl (D-WI), Landrieu (D-LA), Lincoln (D-AR), Miller (D-GA), Nelson (D-NE), and Torricelli (D-NJ).

INITIAL CONSIDERATION OF 2003 TAX CUTS—H.R. 2, 108TH CONGRESS

JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003 (JGTRRA)—P.L. 108-27 (9 MAY 2003)

Question: On Passage: Recorded vote.
Bill Title: Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act.

	Ayes	Noes	Pres	NV
Republican	218	3		8
Democratic	4	199		2
Independent		1		
Totals	222	203		10

4 House Democrats voting aye: Alexander, Cramer, Hall, and Lucas (KY).

Senate Vote Counts: Yeas 51, Nays 49

3 Democratic Senators voting yea: Bayh (D-IN), Miller (D-GA), and Nelson (D-NE).

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF 2003 TAX CUTS—H.R. 2, (23 MAY 2003)

Question: On Agreeing to the Conference Report: Yea-and-Nay.

Bill title: Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Republican	224	1		4
Democratic	7	198		
Independent		1		
Totals	231	200		4

7 House Democrats voting aye: Alexander, Cramer, Hall, Lucas (KY), Marshall, Matheson, and Scott (GA).

Senate Vote Counts: Yeas 50, Nays 50

Vice President Voted Yea.

2 Senate Democrats voting yea: Miller (D-GA), Nelson (D-NE).

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF IRAQ WAR AUTHORIZATION—H.J. RES. 114, 107TH CONGRESS

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—P.L. 107-243 (10 OCT 2002)

According to CRS report RL31715: "In October 2002, Congress authorized the President to use the armed forces of the United States to defend U.S. national security against the threat posed by Iraq and to enforce all relevant U.N. resolutions regarding Iraq."

Question: On Passage: Yea-and-Nay.

Bill title: To Authorize the Use of United States Armed Forces Against Iraq.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Republican	215	6		2

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Democratic	81	126		1
Independent		1		
Totals	296	133		3

81 House Democrats voting aye: Ackerman, Andrews, Barcia, Bentsen, Berkley, Berman, Berry, Bishop, Blagojevich, Borski, Boswell, Boucher, Boyd, Carson (OK), Clement, Cramer, Crowley, Davis (FL), Deutsch, Dicks, Dooley, Edwards, Engel, Etheridge, Ford, Frost, Gephardt, Gordon, Green (TX), Hall (TX), Harman, Hill, Hoeffel, Holden, Hoyer, Israel, Jefferson, John, Kanjorski, Kennedy (RI), Kind (WI), Lampson, Lantos, Lowey, Lucas (KY), Luther, Lynch, Maloney (NY), Markey, Mascara, Matheson, McCarthy (NY), McIntyre, McNulty, Meehan, Moore, Murtha, Pascarell, Peterson (MN), Phelps, Pomeroy, Roemer, Ross, Rothman, Sandlin, Schiff, Sherman, Shows, Skelton, Smith (WA), Spratt, Stenholm, Tanner, Tauscher, Taylor (MS), Thurman, Turner, Waxman, Weiner, Wexler, and Wynn.

Senate Vote Counts: YEAs 77, NAYs 23

Baucus (D-MT), Bayh (D-IN), Biden (D-DE), Breaux (D-LA), Cantwell (D-WA), Carnahan (D-MO), Carper (D-DE), Cleland (D-GA), Clinton (D-NY), Daschle (D-SD), Dodd (D-CT), Dorgan (D-ND), Edwards (D-NC), Feinstein (D-CA), Harkin (D-IA), Hollings (D-SC), Johnson (D-SD), Kerry (D-MA), Kohl (D-WI), Landrieu (D-LA), Lieberman (D-CT), Lincoln (D-AR), Miller (D-GA), Nelson (D-FL), Nelson (D-NE), Reid (D-NV), Rockefeller (D-WV), Schumer (D-NY), and Torricelli (D-NJ).

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF AFGHANISTAN, ET AL. WAR—AUTHORIZATION S.J. RES. 23, 107TH CONGRESS

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE—P.L. 107-40

CRS Summary: Authorization for Use of Military Force—Authorizes the President to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.

States that this Act is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of the War Powers Resolution.

Passed House without Objection 9/14/2001.
Senate Vote Counts: Yeas 98, Nays 0, Not voting 2 (Craig-ID; Helms-NC).

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Houston, Texas, the distinguished gentlelady SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I was listening to the gentleman from Florida, and I want to thank him for framing the discussion as he has done, and really speaking to our colleagues and the American people. I was trying to discern what my colleague was saying, good friend from the other side of the aisle. And I would only say that the only people that are shaking their heads are those who are trying to pay their mortgages, who are trying to make sure that their incoming freshman or upper classman has the tuition that they need to finish school.

Americans are asking us to stop the chatter about procedures and begin to do the work that they need to rebuild this Nation. That's the business of this Democratic leadership, of which I am proud to associate with.

My friends talk about the story of the Recovery Act, and they are absolutely right. We've been so busy with our elbow to the grindstone that we haven't been able to tell the story of the many, many jobs created by the Recovery Act. But watch us in the month of August, when we go home and shine the light on the many, many jobs. In the 18th Congressional District, over \$800 million, 97 projects, job-creating, bridge-making programs to help those in that district.

So today we take another leap of faith. And I hope that we can get an understanding about what this bill does. The bill closes the loopholes, something Americans are very clear about, that are given to corporations to take jobs overseas. If they can do their business here, they need to do it. But in the meantime, what do we give you? First of all, we all know that the government cannot use all the dollars that are issued. When you give money to State and local governments, what do they do? They contract with small businesses in that community who then either keep the employees they have or they expand and need to hire.

And let me give you an example. Build America Bonds is part of this legislation, an exciting way to invest in America. More than \$106 billion of infrastructure investments nationwide will come about because of this. It will not be government workers that will be nailing and cementing and designing, it will be local businesses that will be part of this exciting opportunity. Recovery Zone Bonds that will provide \$10 billion in Recovery Zone Economic Development Bonds and \$15 billion in Recovery Zone Facility Bonds, all having to bring in small businesses.

In my own community of Houston, we are looking at ways to improve our water and sewer. Most communities have aging water systems and sewer systems. There has usually been a cap on how much money a State can spend on water and sewage. We are lifting those caps so that bonds can be issued so that the burden does not fall right away on the taxpayer. These are what we are trying to do to infuse capital not in the pockets of the government, but in the pockets of our businesses that will in turn reinvest in the community and in the government by way of the general churning of the economy. Building, expanding, improving the quality of life that is necessary.

Those who are in need of TANF would be helped. Those who are in need of the expansion of business will be helped. And then what I think is enormously important, we will be investing in real American jobs because we will extend the Emergency Fund for Job Creation and Assistance. These programs provide for short-term, one-time

aid for needy families, and subsidized employment programs help these families put money back into the economy.

So I would argue that we can chatter about procedure, and that's a good talk for inside this august body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. But I can tell you that if anybody is scratching their head at the kitchen table as to how I am going to make next month's payment or tomorrow's payment, if anyone is confused, they're not confused about a procedure that is going to allow this bill to move forward to give them help and not a hand out. They are going to be ready to take advantage of these constructive, financial, and fiscally sound, paid-for vehicles which they can utilize to rebuild their local communities, both rural and urban. That's what America is all about. That's what this debate will be about today.

And in conclusion, I would say adding to a grand and great Transportation-HUD bill, one of the greatest ones that will provide for massive mobility and housing in this Nation, that's what Americans are looking for, for us to stand up and be counted and move this Nation forward. I thank the gentleman for the time. I ask that you vote for the rule and this bill.

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

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

□ 1210

Mr. DREIER. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, for doing her typical spectacular job and appropriately describing this as an outrageous rule. She's right on target. I'd really say "pathetic" when I look at both process and substance, because it is absolutely pathetic. Somebody said to me, well, you can say "outrageous," I can say "pathetic," and we can call the whole thing off.

We'd be a lot better off, Mr. Speaker, if we did, in fact, not consider this rule the way we're doing it. Because while my friend from Houston just said the American people understand the need to get assistance—not a handout but assistance—so that we can get the economy moving, we can get that. But they also want us to do it with the kind of openness and fairness and transparency that we were promised in this great document, A New Direction for America. We've gotten anything but that.

The reason that the substance is pathetic, along with the process itself, is

that is not going to do anything to create jobs. This is designed—and while it wasn't directly said, I certainly inferred it from the testimony that we had in the Rules Committee last night. Well, everybody should have a chance to vote on job creation before we adjourn in August. So that's why this rush.

Well, it's done clearly in the most inappropriate way when it comes to the deliberative nature. There was basically no consultation whatever with the ranking member on the committee. When I asked the chairman on the Ways and Means Committee whether or not there had been any consultation seeking a bipartisan approach, he said that he hoped this would have bipartisan support at the end of the day. When I asked, the only response that I was given was that he had a discussion with the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, our friend Mr. BAUCUS, but no consultation whatsoever.

The bill was introduced at 3:30 yesterday afternoon, and the Rules Committee met 90 minutes later to bring up this measure. Gosh. As I recall, looking at the rules, we should have at least had a 24-hour layover. I would say to my friend from Ft. Lauderdale, what is the rush here? We now know that we're going to be in session on Friday. We know that the Senate is scheduled to meet next week. Is there any reason for us not to have had this bill introduced, allow it to lay over for 24 hours, allow Democrats and Republicans alike to look at it so that we could decide what it consists of, and then have a Rules Committee meeting? I don't know why we didn't do that.

I'm happy to yield to my friend if he would like to respond as to why it wasn't introduced with a 24-hour period to allow us to have it lay over.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I believe that the distinguished chair of the Ways and Means Committee answered my good friend from California yesterday with regard to the immediacy.

Among the things that he said to you was we had waited for the United States Senate, which, if you recall, much of what is in this provision, and he said to you there is nothing new in here that we haven't voted on before.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I might reclaim my time, and I do so to simply say we've heard that tired old argument, that we've voted on these items before. We've never had it as a package like this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Pointedly, did we not vote on the measures in this particular provision?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say the answer is no, we have not voted on this package of items. And let me address this by saying that I don't believe that the litany of items included in this bill which

we're just starting to look at have, in fact, had an opportunity for consideration.

There was somebody who took a glance at it yesterday afternoon who said to me, This is not what we need to be doing to create jobs. What we need to be doing is focusing on reducing the capital gains rate and the dividend tax right now, tax rate. That would do more to stimulate job creation and economic growth than anything that we've got in this piecemeal package that has been put together.

And the transparency, as far as I'm concerned, is based on the following: It's simply a desire to say we've tried to do something to create jobs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have wanted to do that. We've come forward repeatedly with proposals to do just that. And we have tried the policy of dramatically increasing spending in the size and scope and reach of government, and guess what? We were promised that the unemployment rate wouldn't exceed 8 percent if we passed the stimulus bill. We all know that it's at 9½ percent nationwide.

I see my friend Ms. CHU here from California. We have a 12.3 percent unemployment rate. In Los Angeles County, it's higher than that. And in the area that I represent to the east, it's 14.4 percent in parts of San Bernardino County. We have an unemployment rate that is far in excess of what we were promised if we passed the stimulus bill. We have tried that, Mr. Speaker.

Let's now focus on job creation and economic growth with a responsible package, not this pathetic piecemeal approach which is outrageous. And to do it without any kind of consultation whatsoever with the minority is beyond the pale.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure. Let's do what the American people want. Let's have an open debate and let's put into place pro-growth economic policies which have been proven to be successful under President John F. Kennedy, a great Democrat, and under President Ronald Reagan, a great Republican President.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the importance of passing the Investing in American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act, the importance of passing this bill now.

This bill creates jobs, rebuilds infrastructure, and promotes investments that gets our economy going again.

And I want to take a moment to talk about one specific aspect of this bill, the extension of the Emergency Fund for Job Creation and Assistance.

In Los Angeles County, the area I represent, one out of every eight resi-

dents is unemployed. In one area of my district, East L.A., the unemployment rate is 16.75 percent. This is unacceptable.

A while back, L.A. County instituted an innovative program to get people back to work. It uses TANF funds from the stimulus to place unemployed workers in positions for up to a year. And it created over 11,000 jobs in L.A. County and almost 250,000 across the country.

In Palmdale, California, this program helped Jody, a single mother of two, find work at a local coffeehouse. There, Jody so impressed her new boss that he plans to permanently hire her and three others from the program.

But this proven job creation program expires in September. The clock is ticking. If we don't act, those 250,000 tales of success become horror stories. Today's bill will keep those Americans working.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Investing in American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, you know, every time our colleagues come here and talk about the horrible unemployment in their districts, they condemn themselves. They condemn their own policies and the policies of their President because they promised, when President Obama came to office and pushed through the stimulus package, that unemployment would never go above 8 percent. It's been a failure. Everything they've done has been a failure, Mr. Speaker. But they keep trying.

Again, I want to say Einstein said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over again and expecting a different result. That's what our colleagues across the aisle keep doing, the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.

This bill is not going to create private sector jobs. It is only going to put us deeper in debt and cause us to lose more jobs.

My colleague from Texas also mentioned the loopholes, that this bill is going to close loopholes. Well, that is convenient language for our colleagues across the aisle. It's doublespeak. And language means something.

When our colleagues across the aisle talk about a loophole, they're saying this is something that gives us an excuse to raise taxes. The loopholes that they talk about are legal entities in our tax structure that probably most of them voted for.

□ 1220

But when it's convenient for them, they call it a loophole, and let me say also that my colleague from California was absolutely right. The staff from the Ways and Means Committee says this bill is definitely not the same as bills we've seen before. There are items in here that have not been in any other legislation in this session.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the rule before us, we might wonder what mystical legislation would prompt the ruling liberal Democrat regime to resort to such authoritarian tactics being proposed by this rule. Unfortunately, the answer isn't anything American job seekers want to hear but, rather, a rehash of the tired, old, failed destructive policies of this regime who are apparently scared to death that the American people are seeing through their partisan schemes.

While this bill does contain some Federal taxpayer funds to bailout States for infrastructure, they are coupled with tax increases that will be added to the unconscionable liberal tax policy that will bleed the American economy of desperately needed private sector jobs.

Not only does the bill write a blank check by authorizing such sums as necessary—and let me point out to the American people, "such sums" means a blank check. It means they can spend as much as they want to. Here we have the largest deficit in our history, and yet, they're writing another blank check to bureaucrats. But one of the most telling provisions in the bill simply assigns a more politically palatable title to an expensive Federal welfare fund. Indeed, title II, section 201(a)(1) of the bill changes the name of the Emergency Contingency Fund for State Temporary Assistance for Needy Family Programs to the Emergency Fund for Job Creation and Assistance. And again, for those not versed in Washington double-speak, State Temporary Assistance For Needy Families Programs is Washington double-speak for welfare money. This was a welfare bill, part of it was, and it continues to be one, no matter the title.

Apparently our liberal friends on the other side of the aisle are so motivated to create another permanent Federal welfare benefit they simply cannot tolerate the word "temporary" being in the title of their beloved welfare fund. The new title also highlights the misnomer of suggesting that increasing unemployment benefits will increase employment or, as Speaker PELOSI recently put it, growing unemployment benefits "creates jobs faster than almost any other initiative you can name."

Renowned economist Arthur Laffer wrote in the July 8, 2010, Wall Street Journal that: "The Democratic argument also ignores the impact of unemployment benefits on employer costs. Employers don't usually hire people to assuage their consciences. They hire people to make after-tax profits. And if workers require more pay because of higher unemployment benefits, employers will hire fewer employees."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to redistribute wealth. That is what our colleagues across the aisle are so good at doing. And again, as Mr. Laffer pointed out, "The government doesn't create resources." There's always a zero sum game. There's no stimulus given from unemployment benefits.

“To see these effects clearly, imagine a two person economy in which one of the two people is paid for being unemployed. From whom do you think the unemployment benefits are taken? The other person obviously. While the one person who is unemployed may ‘buy’ more as a result of unemployment benefits, the other person from whom the unemployment benefits are taken will ‘buy’ less. There is no stimulus for the economy.”

If unending expansion of Federal welfare benefits is the liberal plan for creating private sector jobs, I’m frightened to imagine what success looks like to them. It’s my hope that this Election Day, or ideally before, that the ruling liberal Democrats learn the lesson that, “When you’re in a hole, stop digging.”

Mr. Speaker, at this time I’d like to say The Washington Times had it right on March 3, 2010. Every bill that comes before the House these days is called a jobs bill. The title was, “Lawmakers cry ‘jobs’ to push through bills.” That’s what we see happening over and over and over again by our colleagues. Again, they can’t stand to say that they’re increasing welfare in this country. They’re trying to say this is creating jobs. It’s not going to create jobs, Mr. Speaker.

We can start today, though, by rejecting this rule, rejecting the underlying bill and doing something about real jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert The Washington Times article into the RECORD.

[From The Washington Times, Mar. 3, 2010]
LAWMAKERS CRY “JOBS” TO PUSH THROUGH BILLS

(By Stephen Dinan)

It was a modest measure to designate several thousand beachfront acres of St. Croix as a National Historic Site, but in the hands of a skilled congressman such as Rep. Nick J. Rahall II, it became yet another jobs bill.

Likewise the Travel Promotion Act, which would create a nonprofit group to push U.S. tourism, has been billed as a job-producing machine by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat.

It doesn’t stop there—backers last week unveiled a bipartisan bill to create a visa category for entrepreneurs, predicting it “will create jobs in America.”

From immigration to clean energy to expanding the social safety net, there’s no better way to grease the skids for new government programs in Washington nowadays than to declare them job-producing bills, then watch supporters line up and potential opposition crumble.

When Mr. Reid dubbed as a jobs bill a simple \$15 billion measure to offer payroll tax breaks and continued highway construction funding, it helped head off a potential Republican filibuster. Likewise, the Trade Promotion Act, which would tout the U.S. as an international tourist destination, sailed through the Senate after it was tagged with the almighty jobs-bill moniker.

Given an unemployment rate hovering near 10 percent, the focus on jobs is not surprising.

House and Senate lawmakers raised the jobs issue on the chamber floors at least 154 times over the past week, and the jobs issue is more popular in Congress now than it has

been in nearly two decades—since the 1991–92 recession.

President Obama joined the jobs chorus Tuesday, touting a \$6 billion plan to offer up to \$3,000 rebates for energy-efficiency home upgrades as “a common-sense approach that will help jump-start job creation.”

Mr. Obama, who used the word “jobs” 11 times in his 17-minute speech in Savannah, Ga., said the issue is dominating his time right now.

“When it comes to domestic policy, I have no more important a job as president than seeing to it that every American who wants to work and is able to work can find a job—and a job that pays a living wage,” he said.

On Monday, Republicans fought back the ever-broadening definition of what creates jobs. They told Democrats to quit trumpeting a \$104 billion bill on the Senate floor as a job creator and argued that it merely continues existing tax breaks and spending that are extended every year.

“The bill before us creates no new jobs, and I challenge my Democratic friends to show us how doing what we always do and what was done last year—extending the R&D tax credit, extending COBRA insurance, extending unemployment benefits—creates jobs,” said Sen. Jon Kyl, Arizona Republican.

Sen. Max Baucus, Montana Democrat, said saving jobs is just as important as creating them. If Congress allows tax cuts to expire, he said, jobs definitely would be lost.

“If the provisions we are seeking merely to extend were not passed, it would be a job destroyer,” Mr. Baucus said.

Members of both sides of the aisle are joining the chorus.

Sen. John Thune, South Dakota Republican, offered an amendment to the \$104 billion extenders bill that would redirect unspent money from last year’s \$862 billion stimulus bill to let small businesses write off more investments and give them a capital-gains tax cut.

“True job creation doesn’t happen when the government adds jobs; it grows when small businesses are given the incentives to thrive,” he said.

Meanwhile, the top Democrat and top Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are sponsoring the immigration bill to increase visas for entrepreneurs.

It’s sometimes tough to see how the jobs math adds up.

The administration has estimated that the \$862 billion stimulus act would create up to 3.5 million jobs, which would seem like a bad deal if a \$15 billion highway funding extension could create 1 million jobs alone, as Mr. Reid has said on the Senate floor.

Mr. Reid also has said a health care overhaul “would create 400,000 jobs a year,” and that his travel promotion bill “will create tens of thousands of jobs in the service industry.”

“It is a jobs bill, and that is an understatement,” he said.

Among the other job creators being touted, the beachfront historic site in the U.S. Virgin Islands stands out.

Democrats, arguing for the bill in January, said designating the site and spending the \$40 million or more to acquire the land will transform it into a popular tourist destination.

“It will create jobs and help ease unemployment on the island,” said Mr. Rahall, the West Virginia Democrat who shepherded the bill through the House.

Dubious Republicans pointed out that the cost of a ticket from the U.S. to the island and the travel time make it unlikely that the new historic site would be a major economic draw.

“Let’s quit spending like crazy. Let’s sell off some of our assets, pay down our debt and

let America find jobs again,” said Rep. Louie Gohmert, Texas Republican.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to my comment about welfare because I think the American people thought that welfare was done away with many years ago in this country, but that simply isn’t the case.

A document that was prepared by the Heritage Foundation and released September 16, 2009, provides a valuable perspective on the current state of welfare spending, and I’m going to be quoting from that document for several moments.

“Welfare spending has grown enormously since President Lyndon B. Johnson launched the War on Poverty. Welfare spending was 13 times greater in FY 2008, after adjusting for inflation, than it was when the War on Poverty started in 1964. Means-tested welfare spending was 1.2 percent of the gross domestic product, the GDP, when President Johnson began the War on Poverty. In 2008, it reached 5 percent of GDP . . .

“Since the beginning of the War on Poverty, taxpayers have given \$15.9 trillion (in inflation-adjusted 2008 dollars) to means-tested welfare. In comparison, the cost of all other wars in U.S. history was \$6.4 trillion (in inflation-adjusted 2008 dollars).”

My colleague across the aisle wants to blame our deficit on the war, and yet, we’re spending much, much more on welfare than we are spending on war, and we have done that since the sixties.

“In his first two years in office, President Barack Obama will increase annual Federal welfare spending by one-third, from \$522 billion to \$697 billion. The combined 2-year increase will equal almost \$263 billion . . . After adjusting for inflation, this increase is two-and-a-half times greater than any previous increase in Federal welfare spending in U.S. history. As a share of the economy, annual Federal welfare spending will rise by roughly 1.2 percent of GDP.”

Americans are already frightened to death of our deficit. Now they’re going to see why a large part of that deficit is here.

“While campaigning for the Presidency, Obama lamented that ‘the war in Iraq is costing each household about \$100 per month.’” Let me say that again. “The war in Iraq is costing each household about \$100 per month,” President Obama said.

□ 1230

Applying the same standard to means-tested welfare spending means that welfare will cost each household \$560 per month in 2009 and \$638 per month in 2010.”

Go on and make all your comparisons you want to about how much is being spent on the war. Keeping this Nation safe is the role of the Federal Government.

“Most of Obama’s increases in welfare spending are permanent expansions of the welfare state, not temporary increases in response to the current recession. According to the long-term spending plans set forth in Obama’s FY 2010 budget, combined Federal and State spending will not drop significantly after the recession ends. In fact, by 2014, welfare spending is likely to equal \$1 trillion per year.”

According to President Obama’s budget projections, Federal and State welfare spending will total \$10.3 trillion over the next 10 years, FY 2009 to FY 2018. This spending will equal \$250,000 for each person currently living in poverty in the U.S., or \$1 million for a family of four.

“Over the next decade, Federal spending will equal \$7.5 trillion, while State spending will reach \$2.8 trillion. These figures do not include any of the increases in health care expenditure currently being debated in Congress.” This was written in 2009 before the health care bill was passed.

“In the years ahead, average annual welfare spending will be roughly twice the spending levels under President Bill Clinton after adjusting for total inflation. Total means-tested spending is likely to average 6 percent of GDP for the next decade.”

I am ending my quote of the Heritage article.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are frightened to death. That’s what I hear every weekend when I go home, frightened to death about the direction of this country. They can identify the fact that we are spending too much. It’s helpful to show them where some of that money is going and to balance out the misinformation our colleagues are giving out across the aisle about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill need to be rejected. I could go on and on about the jobs situation. We know full well that our colleagues like to brag about how many jobs that they have created.

I am only going to show a couple of posters because we talk about this a lot, but I think it’s very, very important to do it. I would like to show the job increases and jobs lost across the Presidencies of President Bush and President Obama.

If we look at this, we will see that from the time President Bush came in,

there was a drop in job growth right after 9/11, but then there was a 46-month steady increase of jobs up to 8.1 million. If you look at President Obama’s administration, there has been a loss of over 3 million jobs.

Now, I know our friends can count this lots of different ways. Another way that Scott Hennessey has said we should do it is to look at the average unemployment rate during a President’s time in office. This clearly shows that under President Obama our average unemployment rate has been 9.5 percent, under President Bush, 5.3 percent. I think that tells the tale. So they can talk about creating jobs; they can talk about all their wonderful policies.

All their wonderful policies have created this hole that we are in. They should stop digging, Mr. Speaker, instead of continuing to dig.

The evidence is here, Mr. Speaker. The liberal Democrat agenda has failed. They need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real solutions to the real problems of the American people.

This isn’t time to dither and blame the Republican minority for the disappointing collapse of governance we have seen since the liberal regime seized control of Congress in 2007, or blame President Bush for everything bad that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I will point out again that this bill is a welfare emergency fund expansion. H.R. 5893 will add \$5 billion to the welfare emergency fund, doubling this fund the Democrats created in their 2009 stimulus bill, again, an example of the fact that the stimulus has failed miserably.

The Democrats’ welfare emergency fund expansion would especially benefit States that have increased welfare case loads and spending on welfare most. The new welfare money will be paid to States in FY 2011, a third fiscal year since this welfare emergency fund started.

Democrats are trying to re-brand this welfare emergency fund to seem to be all about jobs. It’s not.

After calling it the emergency contingency fund for State Temporary Assistance for Needy Family Programs for the last 2 years, Democrats now propose to rename this program the

Emergency Fund for Job Creation and Assistance, but only 25 percent of the \$4 billion in welfare emergency funds has been spent on jobs.

I urge a “no” vote on the bill, Mr. Speaker, and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell me how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, you know, Paul Krugman wrote an article in The New York Times sometime back, and he is the Nobel Prize winning economist. On July 20 he talked about “Tax Cut Truthiness.”

Without reading the entire article, he cites to Erick Erickson and says, “But I think we have part of the key to how Republicans can believe that returning to the Bush agenda is exactly what we need: they’ve invented themselves an alternate history in which wonderful things happened under Bush, and earlier booms have been sent down the memory hole.”

Now, I have had the good fortune of being here in the minority and in the majority. I served 8 years under President Bush in the minority. I also served 8 years during the Clinton administration.

My late mom had a statement about all of us as politicians. She used to say, if you are going to say that George H.W. Bush did it, then you have to say that Jimmy Carter did it and then somebody else will say that Reagan did it. She said why don’t you all just admit it that George Washington did it and get it over with so as how you don’t have to keep pointing fingers at each other.

My distinguished colleague from North Carolina just certainly misspoke and didn’t mean to when she said that this particular measure isn’t scored.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the Preliminary CBO Estimate of Changes in Revenue and Direct Spending of the Investing in America Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010. I might add that it points out that it is revenue neutral, as I said previously.

Preliminary CBO Estimate of Changes in Revenues and Direct Spending of the Investing in American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010

Version: f:\VHLC\072810\072810.211.xml; July 28, 2010 (1:55 p.m.)

(Millions of dollars, by fiscal year)

July 28, 2010

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2014	2010-2015	2010-2019	2010-2020	
TOTAL CHANGES IN REVENUES^a	0	993	2,460	3,100	3,121	5,137	1,518	3,302	3,262	3,243	3,218	9,672	14,809	26,128	29,346	
CHANGES IN REVENUES																
Title I -- Infrastructure Incentives																
Budget Authority	0	554	2,090	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	8,385	11,256	22,738	25,609	
Estimated Outlays	0	554	2,090	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	8,385	11,256	22,738	25,609	
Title II -- Other Jobs Programs																
Budget Authority	0	3,546	-39	-9	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,498	3,498	3,498	3,498	
Estimated Outlays	0	2,634	670	160	17	10	7	0	0	0	0	3,480	3,490	3,497	3,497	
TOTAL CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING	0	4,100	2,051	2,862	2,870	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	11,883	14,754	26,236	29,107	
Budget Authority	0	3,188	2,760	3,031	2,888	2,881	2,878	2,871	2,871	2,871	2,871	11,865	14,746	26,235	29,106	
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN DEFICITS FROM REVENUES AND DIRECT SPENDING																
NET CHANGES IN DEFICITS^{b,c}	0	2,195	300	-69	-233	-2,256	1,360	-431	-391	-372	-347	2,193	-63	107	-240	

Sources: Congressional Budget Office and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes:

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

- a. Negative numbers denote a decrease in federal revenues; positive numbers denote an increase in revenues.
- b. Positive numbers denote an increase in the budget deficit; negative numbers denote a decrease in the deficit.
- c. All effects are on-budget.

I am so glad that my colleague and I come from virtually all the same kinds of backgrounds, if you read her biography and you read my own. We also have been advantaged in this society by taking advantage of the opportunities that were presented to us.

But where we parted company somewhere along the line, well she didn't want, evidently, to give opportunity to those who have no opportunity. I have been taught all of my life to do everything I can for the least of these in society. Now, I heard her, and I agree that the role of government identified in the United States Constitution clearly points out that national security is the role, and a primary role, of the Congress.

But promoting the general welfare is also a role of Congress. When I see, as I do, at the pantry in Fort Lauderdale, them not having the funds to carry forward, when I see the food bank on Oakland Park, that's less than nine blocks from the office where I am privileged to serve the people of the State of Florida, when I see it robbed by thieves so that they can't help the needy, I know that out there somewhere are people that are hurting, and they are hurting that people need our help.

□ 1240

And they need our help whether it's from the Federal Government or the State government or the local government, they need our help. And to suggest by any stretch of the imagination that it is wrong for us to help those who are in need is anathema to my background. And that isn't because I am a liberal Democrat; that is because I am an American citizen who believes in America and who believes in all of its people, whether they are rich or whether they are poor.

Now, I don't believe at all that this YouCut project that my friends have created allows that States do anything less than be incentivized by using the temporary assistance for needy families. No less an authority than the former chairman of the National Republican Party, Haley Barbour, who is now a member of the National Governors Association—and I might add, support for this temporary assistance program is expected to and sought to be brought onboard by the National Governors Association; they support it, the National Conference of State Legislatures, they support it, and the National Association of Counties have all urged Congress to continue the TANF as a way to create jobs and assist families. Listen to what Haley—who I happen to know and I happen to think is a distinguished American and an outstanding Governor of Mississippi—listen to what Haley said on February 17. He said, I hope the program will be extended so more jobs could be created. Now that's a conservative for you.

Now my colleague on the other side, I have been very anxious and very concerned that evidently people in this body do not understand how much Iraq

cost this country. I did not vote for us to go to Iraq, and I am glad I didn't. I did not vote for the supplemental that we passed 2 days ago, and I am glad I didn't because it didn't include things that should have been included. I might add that I can't make Afghanistan make sense when I see the number of young Americans that are being killed in that particular theater. But I do know this: Joseph Stiglitz, who is a economics Nobel Laureate, claimed the Iraq war will cost the United States more than \$3 trillion, and he said the final tally is likely to climb much higher than that. There are others who believe that the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost Americans a staggering \$1 trillion to date, second only, in inflation-adjusted dollars, to the \$4 trillion price tag for World War II. It cost us \$1.1 million per man and woman in uniform in Afghanistan. Now somebody make it make sense to me that it's all right for us to continue down that path while it's not all right for us to have temporary assistance for needy families.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is another tool that State and local governments can use to invest in infrastructure development and put much-needed cash and jobs into the economy. I am well aware that Republicans object to the expeditious nature of this legislation. However, the provisions in this legislation have already been debated and considered on numerous other occasions, and we do need to act quickly.

When we sent it, Mr. Speaker, to the United States Senate, these are the things that were included. My colleague began her remarks today by saying that it's outrageous. I find it interesting that she cited as one of the definitions of outrageous, "exceeding the limits of what is normal or tolerable." It also describes outrageous as "whatever is so flagrantly bad that one's sense of decency or one's power to suffer or tolerate is violated."

Now, I fall into that second category and believe that small business lending is not outrageous. That was what was sent to the Senate that Republicans said no about. I believe that infrastructure investments are not outrageous. Much of that that was sent to the Senate was what Republicans said no about.

Business tax relief; I certainly don't believe that that is outrageous, and that's what was stripped out in the United States Senate by Republicans and was not voted on by Republicans in this particular body.

Individual tax cuts. TANF jobs and emergency funding that we now have some of. Veterans concurrent receipt, I don't think that's outrageous. The National Housing Trust Fund, I don't think in a time of downturn in this economy, with one out of every five Americans facing foreclosure or in foreclosure, I certainly don't think that that is outrageous. I don't think it's outrageous to hold harmless the

provisions for low-income families in this country. They stripped out, by saying no, oil disaster response.

National Flood Insurance, something that has been around that has helped a lot of us all over America, they stripped that out. I don't think that it's outrageous that it was in there.

Mine safety—and we've seen what happened in West Virginia—I don't think taking that out was the right thing to do; I certainly don't think it was outrageous to leave it in there.

Federally declared disaster areas, where floods and drought and other matters have gone on. Agriculture disaster relief was taken out of this measure, and I'm here to believe that it was outrageous? Other expiring disaster relief programs were as well.

Now some of the things that are in there, some of the things that are in it that I don't think are outrageous: It extends the Build America Bonds program that everybody in this institution knows has been successful for State and local government. It makes additional allocation of recovery zone bonds to ensure that each local municipality receives the minimum allocation or equal to at least its share of national employment in December of 2009. I certainly don't think that's outrageous.

And I might add my colleague Mr. DREIER also referred, as did Dr. FOXX, to the outrageousness. I don't think it is outrageous to exclude bonds financing facilities that furnish water and sewage from State volume caps estimated to cost \$371 million over 10 years.

Is it outrageous to eliminate the cost imposed on State and local governments by the alternative minimum tax, estimated to cost \$224 million over 10 years? Is it outrageous to have new market tax credits? Is it outrageous to have emergency job fund creation and assistance, scheduled to expire on September 30, to extend that through 2011?

I don't think it's outrageous to suspend the recognition of foreign tax credits. And even though it is a legal entity in our law, as my colleague has said, I don't think it's outrageous that we close tax loopholes that allow American corporations to take American jobs abroad and cause this economy to continue to be exacerbated.

I don't think it's outrageous for us to offset the cost of this bill. However, the provisions in this legislation, as I indicated, have already been debated and considered on numerous other occasions. In fact, we have already pared down this legislation from the larger measure that I just talked about that the House already passed because the Senate could not get enough votes from the Republicans for passage in their body.

Now, America can continue to put up with these people that drove us in the ditch and give them the keys if they want to and expect that if we return to that era, that we are going to have prosperity. I don't think so. I saw what

happened. I believe Americans saw what happened.

The programs that we are considering are designed especially to assist the American people in times of economic hardship, just like the one our Nation is currently facing. We need to act to help Americans, not find evermore excuses not to help. Republicans have been consistently saying “no” on every jobs package and economic development legislation that we have put forward in this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in this Chamber are against everything coming their way from the Democratic side of the aisle. They want to block any job creation legislation in order to make Democrats look bad for the upcoming election, but they are doing so at the expense of the American people.

□ 1250

This legislation will help. This legislation does not add one nickel to the deficit and does not contain wasteful spending. Democrats are hard at work on an agenda to improve our economy, to create jobs, and to ensure that all Americans—all Americans—will be able to take advantage of opportunities and to have an opportunity to have opportunity as our economy recovers.

I hope that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle will unite with us to help Americans in these most difficult economic times.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to 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.

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

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 307

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in consonance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 5, 2010, through Saturday, August 14, 2010, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, September 13, 2010, or such other time on that day as may be specified

by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate recesses or adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand recessed or adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution is not debatable.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 308

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in consonance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, July 29, 2010, through Tuesday, August 3, 2010, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, September 14, 2010, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or her designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as she may designate if, in her opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution is not debatable.

The question is on the concurrent 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Concurrent Resolution 308 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1569;

Adopting House Resolution 1569, if ordered;

Adopting House Resolution 1568; and

Suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 3040.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

YEAS—231

Ackerman	Green, Al	Obey
Baca	Green, Gene	Olson
Baird	Grijalva	Olver
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Barrow	Hall (NY)	Owens
Bartlett	Halvorson	Pallone
Becerra	Hare	Pascarell
Berkley	Harman	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Paul
Berry	Heinrich	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hill	Peterson
Boren	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hinchev	Polis (CO)
Boucher	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Boyd	Hirono	Posey
Brady (PA)	Hodes	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Holden	Quigley
Brown, Corrine	Holt	Rahall
Butterfield	Honda	Reyes
Capps	Hoyer	Richardson
Capuano	Inslee	Rodriguez
Cardoza	Israel	Ross
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Chaffetz	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Chandler	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Childers	Johnson, E. B.	Salazar
Chu	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Kagen	T.
Clay	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Coffman (CO)	Kildee	Schiff
Cohen	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schrader
Conyers	Kind	Schwartz
Cooper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Scott (GA)
Costa	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Costello	Kucinich	Serrano
Courtney	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Critz	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Sires
Cummings	Levin	Skelton
Dahlkemper	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Speier
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Spratt
DeGette	Lujan	Stark
Delahunt	Lummis	Stupak
DeLauro	Maloney	Sutton
Deutch	Markey (MA)	Tanner
Dicks	Marshall	Taylor
Dingell	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Driehaus	McCollum	Titus
Edwards (MD)	McDermott	Tonko
Edwards (TX)	McGovern	Towns
Ehlers	McIntyre	Tsongas
Ellison	McMahon	Van Hollen
Engel	Meek (FL)	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Etheridge	Melancon	Walz
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Fattah	Miller, George	Schultz
Filner	Mollohan	Waters
Flake	Moore (KS)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Fudge	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Gohmert	Nadler (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Neal (MA)	Wu
Grayson	Oberstar	Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Bocchieri
Adler (NJ)	Bean	Boehner
Alexander	Biggart	Bonner
Altmire	Bilbray	Bono Mack
Arcuri	Bilirakis	Boozman
Austria	Bishop (NY)	Boustany
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Blackburn	Bright
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Broun (GA)