

those buses, those light rails, the steel in the bridges, will be American-made.

Why don't we bring those jobs back home? We can do this using money that is already available, already being spent, but sometimes all too often spent on foreign-made equipment.

Mr. TONKO. And talk about this sort of innovation economy where you invest in America, you make certain that our infrastructure that moves goods and people is as sound as it can be. But as we invest in the growth of jobs and "Make it in America," and you talk about the clean energy economy, the alternative technologies, the innovation that comes with advanced battery manufacturing, that stops the trail, eventually, of dollars that are exported out of this Nation, going into the Midwest, \$400 billion plus a year to maintain this fossil-based economy that has us gluttonously dependent on fossil-based fuels that are imported from unfriendly nations to the United States.

□ 1940

There has to be a cleaner way, a more innovative way, one that embraces the American intellect and the ingenuity that enables us to grow products that are not on the radar screen. That's how a great nation continues its greatness; that's how it continues to become even greater, by putting to work its brainpower and developing products that are kinder to the environment, strong in their manufacturing element that produces here in these United States and draws upon the workforce and the R&D potential of everyone from trades up to the Ph.D.s involved in that equation of success. I think it's a way to empower us across the board.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As we come to the conclusion of this, the Make It In America agenda is a powerful agenda to rebuild the American manufacturing base to put middle class America back to work so that they can have the home that they want, so that they can take care of their children's education, so that they can have, once again, pride in this Nation. We can do it. And these are the policies—a fair trade policy in which we tell China, no, no, no, we're not going to let you cheat on your currency any longer, where the tax policy makes sense.

This one. An example. Somewhere in the last 30 years, built into the tax laws was an incentive for American corporations to shift jobs offshore. They take a job; they send it offshore; they got a tax break. I don't know where it came from. I know it was in the Codes. And what we did in the tax bill last December was to eliminate that tax break for American corporations sending jobs offshore. It passed. The President signed it, but our Republican colleagues, to a person, voted against it. They voted to keep that tax break for American corporations to shift jobs offshore. Doesn't make sense to me, but it's gone. And that's the kind of policy we want to put in place,

where we take care of Americans who are working in America.

Mr. TONKO. And you know, Representative GARAMENDI, just about an hour ago we were talking about it all being about principles, values, priorities, contrasts, and choices. Well, if we go with the choice to not make it in America, not invest in innovation, research for medical purposes, means that we may not be able to contain those costs of medical needs, of health care, because we will avoid the discovery of better treatments, new cures, prevention elements that all come with the medical research and medical innovation that can be made in America.

And then we have opportunities to keep Medicare alive, not destroy it, by containing costs for health care and allowing for the dignity of life and the quality of care to go forward without this treatment to end Medicare. And the choice is to avoid powerful industries like the oil industry, giving them mindless handouts, or do we invest in education, higher education, job creation, quality of life issues, housing opportunities? These are the choices we're talking about.

This hour has been, I think, an opportunity for us to exchange, with a clearer expression, what the contrast is on the floor of the House of Representatives and what it is between this Path to Prosperity that we have seen as a Road to Ruin, one that would end Medicare, continue handouts to record profit oil industries, to continue to advocate for millionaire and billionaire tax cuts at the expense of America's middle class that needs a stronger purchasing power and needs to know that her children and grandchildren will have the opportunities, equal opportunities for quality education and a college degree.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Representative TONKO.

Our promise to the American seniors and those who want to become seniors is that this tombstone that the Republican Party wants to put out there—that is, the termination of Medicare—will not happen. We will not let this happen. Medicare is part of the American agenda. It is part of what is good about America, and it will not be terminated by anybody. That's our promise. That's where we draw our line in the sand.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative GARAMENDI. It has been a great opportunity to share this hour with you.

We only ask that thoughtfulness guide the negotiations—either on a deficit ceiling bill or on budgets as we go forward—thoughtfulness and a desire to grow opportunity for all Americans. We're at our best when the inclusiveness of this process enables everyone to be empowered and not just the special interests, the wealthy oil industry that has set record profits 2 years in a row.

With that, I thank the Speaker for the opportunity, and I yield back the balance of my time.

FRESHMAN CLASS ON JOBS AND DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order regarding the debt and jobs.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here tonight by Members of the freshman class once again to focus this discussion on jobs, and I immediately had just one glaring road sign in my mind as I sat here and listened to the Democrats talk about their so-called plan, "Make It In America," and it's "stop," s-t-o-p. This has to stop. The American people deserve the truth. And what you just listened to, what was just presented to you is not that.

We have got to focus in and look at—which we're going to do tonight in a very good discussion—this job-killing legislation that has been presented by the very side that just stood up and told the American people that we're out to kill Medicare and so on and so forth. People can't make it in America right now because of the heavy hand of government that is bearing down on them, because of this job-killing legislation and overreaching regulation that continues to be promoted by the other side. And we've had enough. So let's stop. Let's stop the demagoguery. Let's get down to the truth. We're going to have that discussion here tonight.

The average unemployed American has been searching for a job for 39 weeks, the longest average time in history to be looking for a job. Twenty-one million jobs are still needed by 2020 to return our Nation to a full job recovery. Companies in the United States of America are hitting the brakes on hiring and production.

I want to start our discussion here and I want to hit on three points. I am going to talk very quickly about health care, about boiler MACT, and about energy and jobs. And that's going to lead for the discussion here tonight.

On May 19, a small business owner received documents from his insurance carrier stating that, due to ObamaCare the coverage in his policy would be updated with the new terms of the law on the anniversary of his enrollment. Four days later, this small business

owner received a statement from the same insurance carrier stating that his monthly premium would increase by 25 percent. And I have those documents here with me tonight.

Why does the administration continue to state that Americans will not see significant increases in their health care coverage when it is already happening right now?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit these documents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CAREFIRST
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 2011.

DEAR MEMBER: the purpose of this letter is to inform you of your premium rate for the upcoming year. Please take a moment to review this important information.

Your current monthly premium is \$174.00. Beginning 08/01/2011, your monthly premium will change to \$218.00. Please note that this is a change in your monthly rate.

We regret this increase is necessary, but it reflects the cost of providing you the coverage called for in your policy. As a not for profit organization, we operate on the smallest possible margins, consistent with financial soundness.

Our service hours are Monday – Friday from 7:00 am – 7:00 pm. So that we may serve you as quickly as possible, please have your ID card available. You can also access your plan information from the convenience of your home computer by visiting www.carefirst.com/myaccount.

Sincerely,

RICH MACHA,
Senior Director,
Customer Service & Technical Support.

CAREFIRST, BLUECHOICE, CARE-
FIRST, BLUECROSS BLUE SHIELD,
May 19, 2011.

DEAR MEMBER, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), also known as the Federal Health Reform law, requires that the coverage policy you purchased be made compliant with the terms of the new law on your first contract anniversary date. These new benefits will improve the benefits under your plan. The changes to your coverage are outlined below and are effective as of your next anniversary date, with the exception of the removal of the lifetime maximum limit which took effect on October 1, 2010.

No Lifetime Maximum: If your plan was subject to a lifetime maximum limit, this limit was removed effective October 1, 2010. You now have benefits with no lifetime maximum dollar limit.

No Annual Dollar Limit on Essential Health Benefits: PPACA requires that certain benefits provided in your coverage plan be considered "Essential Health Benefits". Any annual dollar amount limits applicable to these benefits will be removed, except any annual visit limits that may apply to specific services under your coverage plan which will remain in effect.

No Cost-Sharing for Preventive Services: An expanded range of preventive services, including recommended immunizations and screenings, will become available from CareFirst participating providers with no cost-sharing to you—no deductible, copayment or coinsurance.

Emergency Services: Due to the requirements of the new law, your share of the costs of emergency services you may obtain from an out-of-network provider will be the same as if you saw an in-network provider.

In the near future you will receive a letter with your renewal rates. You will also receive a new ID card and a contract amend-

ment containing the new benefits outlined above.

If you have any questions, please call the Member Service telephone number listed on your member ID card. Our service hours are Monday–Friday from 7:00 am–7:00 pm. Please have your ID card available so that we may serve you as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

ANDREW F. SULLIVAN,
Senior Vice President,
Consumer Direct Services Unit.

The Obama administration is encouraging employers to retain coverage. How can a small business owner retain coverage if it forces them into bankruptcy?

And I'm going to point you again to Don Cox. He's a small business owner. He owns 15 Pizza Huts in Alabama, and he is very proud of his products and his employees. The health care regulation is on the top of his list. In 2014, Don would have to provide all of his employees with health insurance. Sadly, only five Pizza Huts will be able to stay afloat; 10 out of the 15 will go bankrupt due to this health care law. They stand on the floor tonight and they submit to you that we need to make it in America, and we can't make it in America due to their job-killing health care legislation. If Don provides health insurance to all of his employees, then 10 Pizza Huts go bankrupt. And although when we're looking at his balance sheet he is making a profit, almost all of the profits were returned back into the business.

Last week, when we stood on this floor a couple of weeks ago, I talked about Rheem Manufacturing, who spent \$1 million adding on to their already 700,000-square-foot facility in Montgomery, Alabama, where they provide over 1,000 jobs. That \$1 million investment was to comply with Federal regulations.

□ 1950

The Environmental Protection Agency has been an agency that has been particularly troublesome in overburdening businesses and placing roadblocks to domestic energy production.

I want to talk about the EPA's proposed boiler MACT rule and what that would do to small businesses. I have had people in my office all week talking about this. Next week I am going to be touring an International Paper mill in Prattville, Alabama, and boiler MACT impacts 42 boilers and four process heaters at 19 IP facilities. Their compliance costs for just boiler MACT and the commercial and industrial incinerator rule are \$600 million.

This is not rocket science. We are standing around and our friends on the other side of the aisle are asking us, where is our jobs bill? And yet I would like to return the question to them and say, where is yours? All you have done for the past 2 years or more is do your best to stifle job creation, American job creation right here in the United States. Enough is enough. This must stop.

Then, of course, today we learn that the President has decided that he is

going to dip into our own energy oil reserves right here in the United States and yet does everything he can to stand in the way of energy production right here in the United States. We have got to lessen our dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Americans deserve the truth, and I hope tonight's discussion will provide that opportunity.

At this time I would like to yield to my friend from Illinois as much time as he would consume.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I think she said it perfectly. I'm a young guy. I remember in the eighties watching the "Where's the Beef" commercials. Everybody remembers that. Well, here is the question: Where's the jobs? Where's the jobs?

I remember a little over 2 years ago the President promising that if we passed an \$800 billion stimulus, unemployment would not exceed 8 percent. Well, where did that get us? In fact, if you look at the President's own charts, they said that by this time under this stimulus plan unemployment would be about 6.5 percent.

I will tell you, that is compelling when you see that on a chart. When you are a country facing a huge economic crisis in a slide, that is very compelling. But it didn't work. It was a waste. We wasted \$800 billion of hard-earned money, most of which was borrowed, on something that didn't work.

Now, Americans are still feeling the pain. In fact, unemployment went up towards 10 percent. Counties in my district in Illinois have unemployment upwards of 11 percent. It didn't work at all. And now I have actually heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle float a second stimulus. They say, well, \$800 billion wasn't enough. It probably needed to be more. Well, why don't we just make it \$5 trillion or \$10 trillion. If we can just print money and borrow it, tax, borrow, and spend our way to prosperity, make it \$10 trillion. That is ludicrous. We know that is ludicrous.

I hail from Illinois. Illinois is the President's home State. Illinois has a huge problem with folks looking for work that can't find it. Illinois used to be a manufacturing economic powerhouse in the United States. It is not hard to drive around and see abandoned warehouses or abandoned factories. Joliet, Illinois, a city in my district, knows that all too well. They understand that.

So what do we do? Well, recently Illinois came up with a decision. Well, the budget is bad. Yeah, the budget is bad, because you are running business out of your State. As a result they say, we have to raise taxes, so in Springfield they raised the individual income tax rate and then they raised the corporate tax rate.

Now, there has got to be some good news to this, right? Well, the State of Illinois has had \$300 million in increased tax revenues that they have

seen from this corporate tax increase. Oh, but if you read *The Wall Street Journal* just shortly ago, you would read that \$240 million has already been given away to these corporations to incentivize them to stay in Illinois because they were looking at leaving because of this high tax rate.

I will tell you, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over again, but expecting different results. We cannot tax, borrow, and spend our way to prosperity.

You talk to any small businessman out there, small businesswoman or job creator, owner of a factory that is just trying to take their products to market, and they will tell you the biggest hindrance, one of the biggest hindrances, besides a lack of confidence, is the government.

I have talked to a lot of people and said, how much better would your life be if you weren't forced to sit around day after day and just fill out government paperwork? You could take that employee and make them productive. They may be able to go out and sell goods. They may be able to go out and expand the business.

Nope. We have got to tax and regulate in this town. This town is really good at taxing and regulating, at putting things through a bureaucracy and letting bureaucrats have their way.

We are going off a cliff, and it is time to pump the brakes. It is absolutely time for us to get deadly serious about reducing the size of the Federal government, cutting spending, and getting Americans back to work.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to say, where is your jobs plan? Well, we have put forward plenty of jobs plans. One of them includes drilling for oil here at home, which we will get into, which my good friend here actually that will be speaking soon sponsored, and I commend him for that.

But there is a fundamental difference between the two parties here. The Democrats believe that government creates jobs. You hear that all the time in what they say. Listen closely. They say, we just need a jobs bill. We need \$800 billion in more spending. We need this program.

What you are going to hear tonight is the Republican view. The Federal Government doesn't create jobs. The Federal Government can't make jobs. We can take tax money and put it through a bureaucracy and spit out a paycheck. Jobs are created in the free market. We can create an environment for job creation, and that is what our freshman class came here to do, and we aim to do it.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Your comments are right on.

Before we move on, I want to share with you, I heard from a gentleman today, a businessman in Greenville Alabama, and I am going to quote him: "Economic conditions being what they are, we are in a situation where real es-

tate values are declining, demand for our products is declining, and the value of the dollar on world markets is declining. All of these factor into the uncertainty of business today. In the long term, I can't see any expansion until regulations are eased and the health care bill is killed."

Now, you want to talk about whether or not we have a jobs plan? This is their jobs plan. What this businessman in Greenville, Alabama, is facing is exactly what the other side of the aisle has proposed, and he can't create jobs.

We have time and time again shown leadership here in the House, in the majority, trying to repeal this job-killing legislation, and we run into roadblock after roadblock with the Senate majority and with the White House.

I would now like to yield time to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you. I am excited to be here this evening to talk about something that our country has too few of—jobs.

In my neck of the woods in southwest Washington State just about every county, save one, has double-digit unemployment, and we have had those disappointing numbers now for many months, almost 30-plus. So we are at a place right now where families are hurting. Moms who are paying the bills at night thinking about health care payments, thinking about getting the kids to school, how much it is going to cost to fill up the gas tank, what the cost of meeting the mortgage is going to be.

These are the real challenges that middle America is facing right now, and that is why we are here. That is why we are fighting. That is why we want to rein in spending, because, as this chart actually shows, less government means lower unemployment.

Less government spending means, if you look at this, and this is from 1980 to 2010, they have almost tracked equally, our unemployment numbers and the Federal Government spending or outlays. The red line is just that, it is government spending. The blue line is unemployment rate.

It is very easy to see that when the Federal Government actually spends less and leaves that money in the pockets of that mom who is trying to make her mortgage payment, or that single dad who is attempting to get food on the table, put shoes on the kids, pay for the housing, pay for the transportation costs, it means that when we let them keep more of their hard-earned money, we actually improve the economy nationally.

□ 2000

And that's what we need to do. When I travel southwest Washington, over the last few months I have had the opportunity to talk with many, many individuals, businesses, families. And there's really a common theme: Let us succeed. I believe in making it in America. I believe in having things manufactured here and doing things

here in America. Quit relying on these other countries to produce things. But you know what has to happen? We have to create an environment that makes it easier for people to do business here in America.

Let me give you a few names: Tom Cook, he owns Taco Bell franchises in my neck of the woods; Cliff McMillen, owner of Vancouver Pizza; Sherry Malfait, owner of Washougal Flowers. What do all these folks have in common? They're small business owners, number one. They're creating jobs in our community. Secondly, they're all facing government-initiated problems, whether it's higher gas prices because of this administration's refusal to explore for American energy here in the United States; whether it's a regulatory environment like the health care bill that the gentlelady from Alabama talked about. It's one of the number one issues I hear about from small employers. They are unsure what regulation, what shoe is going to drop next when it comes to this health care bill.

These business owners are fighting to survive; and we need to make it easier for them to survive, which is why this House passed over four solutions for gas prices. We heard from small business owners and employers across America, and we responded. We have now passed no less than four bills that allow Americans to explore for American energy using American workers here in America. Four bills. We call on the Senate to step up and pass those bills so that we can create those jobs and we can bring gas prices down so these business owners that I've talked about can compete with businesses not just in the United States but globally.

Talk about regulations? I think about Tidewater Barge, which is located on the Columbia River. The Columbia River is the fourth largest river system in the United States. It is right in my backyard. Tidewater Barge are barge operators. They move freight up and down the Columbia River. Every time I have the opportunity to talk to either those employees or the employer there, they just ask me what's going to happen next. What regulation are you going to send our way that's going to make it more difficult for us to compete.

Health care is a big issue for them. They offer a tremendous health care plan to their employees—vision, dental, you name it. I got the chance to meet with those employees last summer. One of the things that they shared with me—in fact, I had a sweet lady come to me, middle-aged, worked for the company for a while, came to me in tears because she was so afraid of the cuts to Medicare that the Obama administration was putting forward. Over \$500 billion. She knew what that meant for her mother and her mother's health care. She was terrified.

So, on one hand, I have the employee saying this is impacting us individually, and then I have the owner saying, Look, this health care bill is going

to cost my employees this tremendous health care plan. It's going to jeopardize it.

Why are we making it harder for these businesses to operate? We should be making it easier for them to operate, not harder. That's part of what we're doing here. We're going to hold this administration—or anybody, really; it's not a Republican or Democrat issue—we're going to hold anybody's feet to the fire. If you work in the Federal Government and you're making it harder for businesses to survive, guess what, we have our eye on you. And we're going to work to advance policies off this House floor like the American energy bills I mentioned earlier. We've also put in place and are fighting to put in place a replacement bill for the disastrous health care bill that was passed last year.

One of those things that I support and it's making it way through committee right now is purchase of health insurance across State lines. That would allow individuals who are right in one of the most costly insurance markets to purchase health insurance. You get on your computer, just like they do for auto insurance—everybody can think of the lizard or the cave-man—get on your computer and choose a health care plan from any State in the Union. It has to be regulated by one of those States. Pick one that best meets your needs and your pocketbook. That will drive down costs immediately. And it's not going to grow government, and it's not going to cost taxpayers.

These are commonsense solutions that get us where we need to go. They're going to grow jobs in America, and they're going to return and empower families and individuals and business owners, not the government. It's the right solution. I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentlelady from Washington. Again, you make great points. And what we all know as we travel around our districts and we talk to business owners is that it's that very uncertainty associated with ObamaCare that is preventing these job creators to create jobs. They're sitting in their boardrooms, they're sitting around the table in the break room and they're saying, How do we plan for 2014 when we don't know how this is going to affect us? All of the regulations that have yet to be written. Yet, right before we have this hour to share together and to share with America, we see posters of a tombstone where we're out to kill Medicare. Yet ObamaCare alone cuts Medicare by \$500 billion.

We have a plan. They don't have a plan. Their plan is the status quo and Medicare dies. That's their plan. Our plan sustains Medicare for this generation and future generations.

Thank you so much.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I agree with most every-

thing you said tonight, but I have to disagree with you on one point. With regard to Medicare, the President does have a plan. I talk to seniors all over my district. One of the things that makes our seniors so angry is that over the course of their lifetime, the money that they have put in their Social Security accounts, it's been robbed. It's been taken out and spent for other things.

So what the President does in ObamaCare is he takes half a trillion dollars out of Medicare and uses it to spend for ObamaCare. Everyone agrees that we have to fix Medicare. The President agrees there's a problem, Bill Clinton agrees there's a problem, Republicans agree there's a problem. How do we fix it? Well, what the President does is says, I'm going to institute the IPAD board, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is a board that's going to look at prices that we pay our health care providers, and it's going to reduce those reimbursements—reimbursements that are already incredibly low.

What does that mean? It's going to affect the access to care for our current seniors. That is absolutely unacceptable. We have a plan in place that's going to save Medicare, it's going to protect Medicare, and we're going to continue this great program for future generations. Let's not be mistaken. The President has a plan that is going to kill Medicare and provide a lack of service to our seniors.

I do want to move from that to jobs, though, because that is what is on everyone's mind. As I travel central and northern Wisconsin, people are concerned about jobs. There's a lack of opportunity. There's a lack of prosperity. And so I want to review what the Democrats did, which is they talked to folks who will come up with abstract theories. They went and talked to university professors, and they came up with an \$800 billion-plus stimulus bill. Remember, that was their jobs plan: \$800 billion of government spending. They said government spending will lead to economic growth, prosperity, wealth, and sustainable jobs.

We know that government spending doesn't lead to sustainable jobs. It has never worked. It doesn't work. And that's why when they promised that we would have unemployment of only 8 percent and we would create millions of jobs, the alternative happened. We've lost millions of jobs, and we've had unemployment reach almost 10 percent.

What we've done is not talk to the professors who sit in the classroom. I've gone out and talked to job creators, people who are actually putting people in my community back to work. And what do they say? Why aren't they creating jobs? They continually talk about uncertainty in the marketplace. What does that mean? When they talk about uncertainty, they talk about a \$14.3 trillion debt, the fact that we're going to borrow \$12.5 trillion this year

alone. We're going to borrow a trillion dollars every year for the next 10 years. As the gentleman from Illinois said, we are cascading towards a cliff and there's a road sign that says: Danger: Pump the breaks. You're about to go over. That's what we're going to do.

Our job creators are saying, Listen, with this massive debt, it creates uncertainty. It creates uncertainty because we don't know what interest rates are going to be in the very near future. We're concerned about inflation because government is printing money to purchase our debt. They're concerned about punishing tax increases. They're concerned about health care costs with ObamaCare. As the gentlelady from Alabama said, they're concerned about regulation.

□ 2010

In my district, we have a great forest product industry. We make paper in my district. Boiler MACT is going to kill jobs in central Wisconsin and send them to China where they have no regulation.

All these things have come together to create uncertainty, which means our job creators aren't reinvesting; they're not expanding; they're not growing; they're not innovating. Do you know what? It doesn't hurt the job creator. It hurts the families in our communities because they have a lack of opportunity for jobs.

I want to just point to a chart that we have here.

When we have recessions, there is what's called "symmetry." If you have a U-shaped decline in this recession, you'll have a U-shaped recovery. If you have a V-shaped decline, you'll have a V-shaped recovery. That's our history, and you'll see that in this chart. What has happened differently in this recession, the great recession, is we've had a V-shaped decline; the recovery has ticked up a little bit, and then it has flat-lined. Why has it flat-lined?—because of the uncertainty that has been created coming from Washington: from our Democrat colleagues on the other side of the aisle and this administration. It's causing a lack of willingness for our job creators to reinvest.

I want to bring up one last point.

I continually hear how our friends want to increase taxes on our job creators. I think anyone who looks at that says we will not create jobs by taxing the job creator. I think it's a good example. If those who say we should raise taxes are concerned about jobs going overseas, it's a pretty simple example that I use:

You have Wal-Mart and Target and Kmart—all the big-box retailers. They compete against one another, right? They're competing. Yet Kmart is not doing so well. They're laying people off. They're closing stores, right?

My friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, they would come in and they would advise Kmart. They'd say, Listen. You have to bring in more revenue. You have to keep

these people employed. You have to keep these stores open. You need more revenue. To bring in more revenue, all you have to do is raise your prices. If you raise your prices, you'll bring in more revenue.

We all know that's not what will happen. If you raise your prices at Kmart, you will drive more shoppers to Wal-Mart and Target. If you raise the cost of doing business in America, you are going to send more of our jobs to China, India, Mexico, Vietnam; but you're going to outsource these jobs because you're raising the cost of doing business in America.

Let's make sure we make America a competitive place where our job creators can do what they do best, which is to create jobs and to put our hard-working families back to work.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much. I appreciate your comments.

As I did, you brought up Boiler MACT. I do want to point out that we have a colleague from Virginia, the gentleman from Virginia, Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH, who introduced legislation just yesterday—again showing leadership on this side of the aisle—about deregulating the EPA to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial and institutional boilers, process heaters, incinerators, and for other purposes. For that, we are very grateful for his leadership.

I would now like to yield time to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for her leadership on this matter and for the time and opportunity tonight to speak about jobs, our economy and what's happening to our country.

Something that really startled me a little bit tonight was when the gentlelady from Washington made this statement. In speaking to her constituents, in speaking to businesses around her district, she mentioned that one of them said, Let us succeed. I was taken aback when she said that, that somebody would actually come to her and say, All we want the government to do, all we want our policymakers to do, all we want our regulations to do is to let us succeed.

Isn't it amazing that we have transformed our economy from a time when people could go out and achieve what they wanted to achieve by working hard, by sacrificing, by taking risks, and now they're concerned because their government is in a place where it won't let them succeed. I'm glad that you mentioned that tonight because I think that's at the very heart of what every single one of us has talked about tonight and what we will continue to talk about over the next months and years to come:

How do we make sure that the policies that we put in place in this country aren't government-driven decisions that dictate what we're going to do for people's businesses or lives—but instead get government out of the way so that we can let our businesses, our

families and America's working families succeed?

Yesterday, a report was issued by the Congressional Budget Office, but I don't know how many people saw or took the time to listen to or to read what the Congressional Budget Office report had to say. It talked about the fact that we have a \$1.6 trillion deficit in this country and that we have a \$14 trillion debt, all of this at the same time that our unemployment levels in this country have crept back up over 9 percent—unacceptably high.

Those of us in the Chamber tonight were sent here in November because we believe that we have more important work to do than simply spending money that we don't have, than passing regulations that kill jobs. The work that we were sent here to do in November is work to get our economy back on track.

The report from the Congressional Budget Office indicates that the situation of our economy is actually worse than many have been led to believe. Our national debt will grow to be larger than the entire U.S. economy this year. We officially owe more than the entire country produces in a year. That will happen at the end of this year. If this isn't a wake-up call to what is happening in our economy, to what is happening in our spending, I don't know what will be. We cannot afford to wait and delay. We've got to solve this problem now.

I want to read a quote from the Congressional Budget Office report: The sooner that long-term changes to spending and revenues are agreed on and the sooner they are carried out once the economic weakness ends, the smaller will be the damage to the economy from the growing Federal debt.

The report didn't say we can avoid the damage. The report didn't say there won't be any damage. The report said the smaller will be the damage. A \$14 trillion debt. A \$1.6 trillion deficit. That is damaging our economy; it's damaging our country, and it's damaging our opportunity to create jobs and long-term economic stability. It is a clear call to action from the Congressional Budget Office. We've got to be bulldogs around this Chamber when it comes to reducing our spending. We have to make sure that we are standing up to the regulators who want to put people out of business simply because they're sitting behind a desk and think they can.

Tom Blach is a constituent of mine who came to me 2 years ago and said, I'm worried that I'll lose my business because of overregulation. Do you know what he saw over the course of the last 2 years? He saw the people he did business with, the people he partnered with leave the State of Colorado because of overregulation.

Last Saturday, I had the opportunity to tour Roggen, Colorado, Haxtun, Colorado, Akron, Colorado, in the Eastern Plains to talk to farmers, wheat growers, cattlemen, ag businessmen, all who

came to me with a similar theme: what is happening to them with overregulation and their concern that they won't have the opportunity to pass on their legacies to future generations because of a government that has decided it knows best and knows more than they.

I want to talk a little bit about what the gentlelady from Alabama said when she was referring to the tombstone that we saw shown earlier by the minority, which said "ending Medicare" on the tombstone.

Today in committee, we had an opportunity to vote on an amendment that said we will oppose and vote against any amendment, any bill, any legislation that would end Medicare. Do you know what our colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle did? They voted "present." They voted "present," refusing to stand up for Medicare because they know, when we ask where their plan is, they don't have one. When we ask them where the jobs are, they don't know. When we ask them for leadership, they run and hide. Why?—because they're voting "present" when it comes to saving Medicare.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for yielding time, and I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor of the House tonight to stand with us as we have a discussion with the American people—an honest and open discussion. That's what we were called to do in November of this past year with the great election that brought this majority to this Chamber, because we were sick and tired of the smoke and mirrors, of the gamesmanship and of the political rhetoric of yesterday.

□ 2020

We are here today to lead. We are here today to talk in an honest and open fashion about not talking points generated from a political party but a philosophy that will bring America back to be the land of opportunity, not only for us but for our kids and for our grandchildren.

You know, I love hearing the stories that my colleagues are offering about constituents from their home district, about people that are suffering and that are looking for jobs, that are in the ranks of the unemployed. But I also think of the people that are presently in a job, people like Brad Pfister and his wife, Tammy, who are raising a beautiful young girl by the name of Alexa, and they sit in their living rooms, watching their daughter play with the family toys, the Slinky, all the things that, you know, we think of as the American Dream, the things that we enjoy with our families. And what he's worried about is will he have a job, not just tomorrow, but will he have a job 6 months from now? Will he have a job a year from now?

That uncertainty, that fear is something that the men and women and

children of America should not have to live in because we are the strongest Nation on the face of the Earth. We are the land of opportunity. So, when you hear us talking here tonight, it is not about political posturing. It is about articulating a philosophy to America that we, each of us, hold dear, and the philosophy can really be summed up in four points.

You hear us talk a lot about the national debt, and I've been asked at town hall meetings on a regular basis, why is that such a fundamental issue? Why, other than the threat that it presents to us as a Nation, because everyone gets that, why is it so important that we get the national debt under control? And my response has always been that if you're going to create the confidence in the American market in the people that are going to expend millions, billions of dollars to create that new manufacturing base in America, they've got to have the confidence that the American market, that the fiscal house of the United States Government, is in order so that they can make that investment in a safe and secure market. So that's issue number one.

Not only do we have to balance the books and get our fiscal house in order, we have to have an honest conversation about removing the excessive regulations that are being promulgated out of Washington, D.C., and in our State capitals throughout the entire Nation. And when we talk about that, what we're talking about is not going in and repealing all regulation. It's about having commonsense, reasonable regulatory oversight, but not going to the point that we're seeing out of Washington, D.C., that is letting go of common sense and regulating, in my opinion, for the sake of just regulating. That is not good government.

We also believe that our Tax Code in America needs to be reformed. We have talked greatly about it, not only because it's the right thing to do, but also to create a marketplace in America that's going to be competitive worldwide because we are in the world economy. That is the reality of our world, and we need to recognize it, and we need to give our private sector those tools or that environment that allows us to compete on the world economic stage.

The fourth point that I think many of my colleagues here tonight hold near and dear, just like I do, is that we have to adopt and commit our Nation to a comprehensive, domestic orientated energy plan. Why is that important? Not only because of the national security interests that so many people can inherently latch on to—you know, we are importing about 9 million barrels of oil a day, coming from countries and sources that are publicly adverse and sworn enemies of the United States of America. So it just doesn't make sense. But a second issue that needs to be articulated on the energy plan is that if we can grow a domestic,

stable source of energy here in America, we will create a marketplace in America that can rely on long-term, stable, low-cost sources of energy.

I can tell you as a small developer myself, when I looked at putting a project together, there were always three things I looked at in the private sector. I said, what are the taxes, what are the insurance costs, and what are the utility costs? And as a mayor of a small city, the city of Corning, my hometown in New York, when I met with developers who were looking to locate into our community, utility costs were always in the top three of concern.

So, if we can adopt and commit ourselves to a domestic orientated, comprehensive energy plan, I am confident we can lower those costs so the American market can become competitive again. That means bringing back our manufacturers. That means building things here in America. And as my colleagues have articulated over and over again, government is not here to create jobs. That is not what our Founding Fathers envisioned. What the Founding Fathers envisioned was a government that preserved and protected the right to have the opportunity to succeed in one's life, not a guarantee to succeed, not one where the government is the one signing the front of the paycheck, but, rather, the individual is going out and earning that paycheck without interference from the government and from sources in the private sector.

I am so happy to be here with my colleagues this evening, and I join you proudly in this fight, in this philosophy of leadership that we have brought to Washington, D.C., and will continue this fight and continue the leadership out of this House Chamber to stand for America, for our kids and our grandchildren, and make it again the land of opportunity that we have all enjoyed.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Before I call on the gentleman from Arkansas, I just want to make a point to your story about a company here in the United States trying to achieve exactly what you're talking about. We know the private sector creates jobs. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, all they're doing is standing in the way. We continue to lead, to deregulate.

Recently, a startup company named Staxxon based in Ohio developed prototypes and patented an innovative new technology for shipping containers that could save U.S. manufacturers, retailers, and sea, rail, and truck carriers millions of dollars annually by reducing the cost of moving and storing shipping containers. Staxxon raised about \$1 million, all private money, to hire 5 people, buy supplies, hire local welders, and build prototypes. The third party costs—attorneys, accountants, filing fees, printing, et cetera, of compliance with the relevant security regulations to raise \$1 million in \$30,000 units from private individuals was over

\$75,000, enough to hire a full-time welder.

He has expressed the need to make the regulatory barriers to raising private investor startup money for innovative entrepreneurial companies like Staxxon much lower while maintaining reasonable protections for private investors and large banking and investment companies.

It is easier for an individual to get a credit card with a \$30,000 limit or a home equity loan for \$30,000 than it is for the same person in this country, the United States of America, to decide to invest \$30,000 in a United States startup company like Staxxon, which goes directly to the point that you're making.

Again, House Republicans continue to lead, but we don't see the same leadership on the other side of the aisle.

I would now like to yield time to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama.

One of the ways that we in the House are focused on creating an environment so the private sector can create jobs is by pushing the President to do something about the pending trade agreements. There are three pending trade agreements: one with Panama, one with Colombia, and one with South Korea. And all three of them are just sitting there, sitting there while other countries are developing relationships and increasing exports to these countries.

Now, in January of last year President Obama said, "If America sits on the sidelines while other Nations sign trade deals, we will lose the opportunity to create jobs on our shores."

□ 2030

I couldn't agree more. The President recognized last year that we need to move quickly with regard to these agreements that will increase exports. Why? Because if we increase exports, we increase jobs. Some estimates say that if we pass these three trade agreements, that we will create hundreds of thousands of jobs. So it's not just important that we pass them. It's important that we pass them quickly.

Why? Well, I sat down this past week with the Ambassador from Colombia, and he was talking about how his country has greatly increased trade with Europe while they're waiting on the administration here in the United States to move on the agreement with their country so that we can increase our exports and do business more efficiently, create jobs in this country. He said, We're waiting. We're waiting for the administration to take action. We keep hearing, It's coming. It's coming. We're working on it. But he knows that those are just words. We need to get these trade deals passed and in place so that we can compete.

Right now, businesses from Europe are visiting South Korea, they're visiting Colombia, they're visiting Panama, and they're doing business. And

the problem that we have, even if we ultimately get these agreements passed—and I certainly hope we will—we will have lost valuable time. It's not like flipping a switch. When the agreements are passed, everything is equal. We're competing with Europe for the business of Colombia or Panama or South Korea. It's not that easy.

Why? Because while we are sitting on the sidelines waiting for these deals to be passed, the Europeans and others around the world are developing relationships. They're flying to these countries. They're meeting for lunch. They're touring their factories. They're exchanging business cards. They're signing contracts, all while we sit idly by, waiting on the President to do something.

The President talked about doing something on these deals last year. He recognized that if we don't do something, we're going to lose the ability to compete. But what has he done? Nothing. Talk is cheap, Mr. President. We are waiting on you to move these trade deals with Colombia, with South Korea, and with Panama. You want to do something that sends a signal to this country that you are serious about job creation, Mr. President? Then get those deals passed. Get those deals passed. Get out of the way of our businesses and let them compete with Europe and other countries around the world so that they can create jobs. We're ready in this House. We're ready. We will help you get them passed. Just join us, Mr. President.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman.

It's good to be with you all this evening and talking about the situation that we are currently in in our country. I will tell you, what a sobering moment, being first elected to Washington and coming and finding out about the budget situation that we currently face. This is about our kids' and our grandkids' futures. And I know for myself and for all of you that that is why you run for office, that is why you ran to come to Washington is to address the challenges that we have here in Washington.

It's hard to comprehend the budgeting that has been taking place over the past several years here in Washington, D.C. When we're all back at home and we're facing a tough economy, we're facing a job market that is not that strong, our friends and family, we have people that we know personally that are out of work and are trying to survive in a very fragile economy, yet it seems like we come to Washington and we explain the situation back home and it continues to fall on deaf ears. It falls on deaf ears at the White House. It falls on deaf ears on the other side of the aisle. It falls on deaf ears in the Senate. And ladies and gentlemen, I believe that this is a time

for us. This is the greatest opportunity that we will have to change the way Washington works.

We talk a lot about the debt that we are facing here in this country, \$14 trillion of debt. We have a debt ceiling, a vote that's coming up here before long. We've almost maxed out the credit cards. And there's just no discussion, no real fortitude to deal with the spending habits of Washington, D.C.

Now, I can tell you that taxes and debt kill jobs, and if we want to get people back to work, we need to tackle both of those and address them in a meaningful way that will produce work for Americans.

I was in a Budget Committee meeting today, and it just is so surprising to me and it just shows the position of so many Washington politicians, that they're out of touch with reality. And that when you have a \$1.5 trillion deficit, the quickest way for politicians in Washington is, well, let's just raise taxes. Well, if any taxes go up in this economy, it's going to kill job creation.

As my friend from Wisconsin was talking earlier about the comparison between Walmart and Kmart, he hit the nail on the head. You raise prices, people are going to go somewhere else. And the solution to the Democrats here in Washington is, well, let's just raise taxes to pay for the deficit that we have.

Let me just give you a quick comparison—and I will end briefly here—is that if you are making about \$2,000 a month but you are spending \$3,500 a month, you are in a pretty deep hole. And every American knows it. We all know that if you are spending \$1,500 more than what you are taking in a month, that's a recipe for disaster and bankruptcy. That's where we are at in Washington. The Federal Government is spending \$1,500 a month more in comparison to what we're taking in in a month.

Now, their solution is taxes. Their solution is to increase the debt. Neither one of those is the right solution. I believe for us to get jobs back in our economy and job creators who are working, whether it's down at the McDonald's and it's those who are going to be, you know, making the Big Macs there at McDonald's and providing a job for a high school kid or for a college kid, that's what people are looking for. They are looking for confidence in this market.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's good to be with you this evening. I'm thrilled that you are here and that you are spreading the message of what needs to happen here in Washington. I look forward to more discussion.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you.

And as we move into a discussion now, with the little bit of time we have left, it's like owning a business that brings in \$100,000 worth of profit, yet you owe the bank \$400,000. That, again, goes to the example that you made about your household, our businesses.

Everyone is tightening their belts in this country but for the Federal Government.

I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. You know, it's really interesting. There are two different philosophies competing here. One is government does it best, and the one you hear tonight is that the American people do it best.

This last week in the Small Business Committee, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner was there defending how slowly they have moved to make credit available to small business. When I think about small business owners—Steak Burger in Vancouver, you can get a great steak burger there, steak sandwich—you know, these are small businesses that are hiring young people, high schoolers, kids in college. And as they are trying to keep some of these part-time, minimum-wage kids in jobs, right, it's making it harder for them when the Treasury Secretary believes that raising taxes is how we meet the spending binge here. It's just ridiculous. It's two fundamentally different beliefs.

We here on the House floor tonight believe that Americans can grow jobs and manage their own money much better than the Treasury Secretary or than Washington, D.C. It's just plain simple.

So, thank you.

Mrs. ROBY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I want to say, look, this is a great example of freshmen that have come here from all different backgrounds for the purpose of saving our country, saving our Union. And we've seen a great diverse group here from different States, from different backgrounds, and it really is amazing.

I've got to just say, standing here, I am inspired by what I am seeing for the future of America, and I really think we are going to go some places.

□ 2040

I think we cannot be second-best anymore. I don't think people have to say that America is going to be second-best. We can always stay best.

Mrs. ROBY. And, again, at forums like this tonight, as I stated at the beginning, Americans deserve the truth, and the strongest truth comes directly from the mouths of Americans who are feeling the pain in their homes and in their businesses.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I agree. Americans are sick of being lied to. We're going to level with the American people.

We just had a joint economic hearing a couple of days ago, and we learned that it is 18 percent more expensive to manufacture in America as opposed to other countries, and that's outside of wages. That's our Tax Code and our

regulations. It's more expensive to manufacture in America. Those are the policies right here in Washington that are making it more expensive. That's absolutely wrong.

I've got to tell you I had a chance to listen to our colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle go on about tax breaks for big oil companies. I don't know if anyone heard their great conversation about tax breaks for big oil companies.

But I just got here in January. I'm a freshman. I'm new to this, but I don't recall our passing any bills that had tax breaks for oil companies. And they had control of this House for 4 years. Where were their bills to deal with tax breaks for big oil companies? I never saw them.

I hear this commentary that tries to get people ginnyed up, and it takes our eye off the ball, which is true job creation and making us more competitive in a global economy.

Mrs. ROBY. And becoming less dependent on Middle Eastern oil is all about these very energy bills, that, again, we have shown consistent leadership on just in the 6 months that we've been in the majority.

I go to the gas pump. I pump gas in my car. I know how much it costs. I'm in the grocery store. I see the rising costs of food as it relates to these energy costs. And yet again today we see the President dip into our oil reserves, which should be for emergencies, yet we're using it for politics at a time when this country must become less dependent on Middle Eastern oil.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlewoman.

And what's amazing about the argument, today the President releases the oil from our emergency reserve. Yet yesterday on this very floor, a number of people were arguing that, no, we don't need new expansions in production. We don't need more oil being put online in this country because that won't lower the price of fuel. So yesterday they were saying that more supplies won't reduce the price of fuel, but today they're saying release this strategic petroleum reserve because it will reduce the price of fuel. A very confused argument.

Mrs. ROBY. Very. Thank you so much.

Mr. DUFFY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROBY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. And if you look at tapping into these oil reserves, what does that do to endanger the security of this country? As the gentlelady knows, in the South, whether it's tornadoes or whether it's floods or whether it's hurricanes, things happen in the gulf where we would have to tap into the reserve because our energy supply could be at risk. And here for political purposes to try to drive prices down over the summer driving season, the Presi-

dent has tapped into that reserve. I think that's absolutely unacceptable for political purposes, especially, as we know, that real risks come up that can cause us a need for that energy supply.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas very quickly.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would just like to say there have been a lot of topics covered tonight, from Medicare to debt to energy. They all relate to jobs. Whether we're talking about reducing the regulatory burden, revising the Tax Code, passing trade agreements, working on energy development and becoming more energy independent, or paying down the debt, they all relate to job creation and making this a country where the private sector can create jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. Again, thank you to all of the freshmen who are here tonight and the States you represent, the districts you represent. We all are here to work for America and American jobs. Thank you for your time, and I look forward to doing this again soon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BERG (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today from 4 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of flooding in his district.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 24.

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 24, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2151. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) (RIN: 0750-AG74) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2152. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement (RIN: 0750-AH23) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2153. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Foreign

Acquisition Amendments (DFARS Case 2011-D017) (RIN: 0750-AH16) received June 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2154. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the President approved a new Unified Command Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2155. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Agency Office of the Inspector General (DFARS Case 2011-D006) (RIN: 0750-AG97) received June 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed change to the U.S. Army Reserve Fiscal Year 2009 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2157. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8181] received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2158. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Securities of Nonmember Insured Banks (RIN: 3064-AD67) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2159. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Record Retention for Regulated Entities and Office of Finance (RIN: 2590-AA10) received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2160. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-first annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2161. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Certification and Certification of Homeless, Migrant and Runaway Children for Free School Meals [FNS-2008-0001] (RIN: 0584-AD60) received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2162. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2163. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2164. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a six-month report prepared by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, and continued through August 12, 2010 to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.