

of Glendale. Carlos was a gentleman in every sense of the word—kind, thoughtful, and absolutely dedicated to serving his constituents.

When I was first running for office early in my career and met Carlos, he was always gracious, even fatherly, taking me aside to give me advice and counsel, though we were in different parties. He was at all times hard-working and ethical. I never remember Carlos saying an ill word about anyone. He was able to disagree about policy without making it personal, and he provided a great example for another generation that has gotten away from that kind of civility.

Carlos served the communities in his district ably and effectively throughout his years in Congress. He served as ranking member on both the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committees during his tenure. He was particularly known for his expertise on energy policy and intellectual property.

Carlos is survived by his wife, Valerie; three children; six grandchildren; a sister; three nieces; and nephews.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

I would ask you all to join me in a moment of silence in memory of Carlos Moorhead.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. However, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. We currently expect last votes for the week no later than 3 p.m. on Thursday, but Members are advised to keep their plans flexible as we continue to work towards adjourning for the first session.

Similarly, Members were informed yesterday that we now expect to be in session and voting the week of December 12. The exact voting schedule is not known and will depend on the progress of our legislative business.

Next week the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules on Monday and Tuesday. A complete list of these bills will be announced by the close of business today.

For the remainder of the week, the House will consider two bills which are part of the House Republican jobs agenda: H.R. 10, the REINS Act, sponsored

by Representative GEOFF DAVIS of Kentucky; and H.R. 1633, the Farm Dust Regulation Prevention Act, sponsored by Representatives KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota and ROBERT HURT of Virginia.

In addition, we may be able to go to conference on a couple of year-end items, and we may consider legislation related to expiring provisions of existing law.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

If I can clarify, and I understand that we are coming up to the end of the year. There is a lot of business which needs to be done in the time remaining, and so I understand his urging to be flexible.

My Members have asked me, I'm sure. Your members have as well, Friday the 9th is scheduled on the calendar to be a nonwork day, as a matter of fact, the 8th was the target date. Either side very rarely meets its target. But in your flexibility—clearly we've told our Members the following week, the week of the 12th, that undoubtedly we're going to be here. But can you give them some sort of confidence level with respect to the 9th, or is that not possible?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as I've said earlier, it is our intention to finish legislative business for the week next Thursday at 3 p.m. and again to remain flexible while we monitor the progress of all of the discussions going on with the gentleman's side of the aisle, both in this Chamber and the one across the way.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, thank you for that.

Let me posit a possibility here. Thursday at 3 o'clock we clearly, I don't believe, aren't going to finish the business that we need to finish before we leave. Therefore, my presumption is we will be back in the following week. Therefore, Friday would not be the last day and therefore we could do whatever we have to do on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and we should plan on a five-day week at least for the following week.

Is that correct?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman again the request is for Members to leave their schedules flexible. As I indicated we do expect to be in session the week of December 12 but the exact voting schedule is unknown at this time and will depend upon the discussions surrounding the issues that we need to address prior to the Christmas holiday.

Mr. HOYER. Further on the schedule, just so our Members have pretty clear information, the week of the 19th, which is the following week, can you give me some thought on what you are advising your Members with respect to the week of the 19th?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman I join with the Speaker in saying that we want to be out of

here by the 16th, and it will all depend on whether we get the work done. It is not our desire to be here the week running up to Christmas. And I would say to the gentleman that it is my hope that we can finish our business by the end of the week of the 12th.

□ 1230

Mr. HOYER. I want to tell my friend that there is overwhelming bipartisan unanimity on the gentleman's hope; but for the purposes of my Members, I will say that I would hope our Members would take the flexibility beyond the week ending on the 16th and make sure, at least on the 19th and 20th and 21st, that they're flexible as well. I think none of us want to be meeting that week, but we have a lot of work to do, as the gentleman knows.

The gentleman has announced that we may go to conference next week on the MilCon bill that was passed by the House and the Senate. It is the only bill that, I think, is in that status.

Do you anticipate other bills being added in that conference? Of course, we all know there are nine appropriations bills which still remain unpassed, a number of which have not passed the Senate and some of which have not passed the House, itself.

Will the gentleman clarify the situation that may result or may be effective as it relates to such a conference with respect to the other appropriations bills.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is asking about the shape or form of an appropriations package and what it is we'll be voting on. As the gentleman knows, the committee on both sides of the aisle is engaging in discussions to try and finish up our work, and I look forward to that happening, again, within the time frame in which both of us would like to see it happen.

Mr. HOYER. That doesn't clarify it very much, but I understand the gentleman's problem with respect to what is being done. Let me ask the gentleman:

If we can't get agreement, in light of the gentleman's focus on the 16th as the date of adjournment, is the gentleman saying that we might consider a CR for some period of time, either a balance-of-the-year continuing resolution or a continuing resolution for some other time?

Mr. CANTOR. Our hope is, again, to be able to avoid that so that we can have a full appropriations package to dictate the priorities that we can agree upon for spending in the rest of the year.

Again, as the gentleman knows, we are operating within the context of the Budget Control Act, the agreement that was put into law at the end of the debt ceiling discussions at the beginning of August of this year. The amount of spending reductions is not enough for many of us on our side of the aisle and perhaps may not be enough or too much on his side of the aisle; but we are operating under the

deal that was agreed upon, and the hope is to try and finalize all bills; and we're working towards that end at this point.

I thank the gentleman for the question.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I am pleased to hear that he is going to be sticking with the level of funding that we agreed upon. I think the gentleman's observation is correct: there are many people on my side who believe that is lower than is necessary to meet the responsibilities they would like to see met, and on your side it's too much in terms of the fiscal situation that confronts us; but I am pleased to hear that we're going to be consistent with the 1,043 discretionary number that was set forth in the Budget Control Act.

My friend knows that, in the Budget Control Act, we also provided for some headroom for emergency spending as a result of disasters. The gentleman well knows our region in the Northeast was hit very hard by a hurricane. We've had an earthquake. We've had tornadoes and other natural disasters. That gave \$11 billion of headroom.

Will we continue to honor that part of the agreement as well?

Mr. CANTOR. As I said earlier to the gentleman, our intention is to operate and abide by the terms of the Budget Control Act.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

I was profoundly disappointed that the so-called supercommittee, or the special committee on deficit reduction, either was unable to reach an agreement on at least a \$4 trillion agreement to reduce our deficit or, as I had urged individually, to extend its life for a period of time, 60 to 90 days, which would have allowed us further opportunity to reach such a deal.

I think that it is absolutely essential for our country. I think it would be an extraordinary plus for our economy if we were to reach such an agreement. I think it would raise the confidence of the American people and raise the confidence of the international community and, not inconsequentially, that of the rating agencies as well. We didn't reach an agreement. We didn't extend the life of that commission. I would like to see us set up another process which would give us accelerated consideration of such an agreement.

Having said that, we built into the Budget Control Act a disciplinary consequence of that failure, which was the sequester—a \$1.2 trillion across-the-board cut, divided equally between defense and non-defense discretionary spending. The Speaker had said that we are morally bound to accept the defense cuts if the supercommittee failed.

I wonder if you support the Speaker in that commitment.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman that I don't know the quote from which the gentleman pulls as to the Speaker's statement. I know that I

share with the Speaker a commitment towards fiscal discipline and that there will be the requisite cuts to go along with the increase in the debt ceiling that will occur by law at the end of this year.

It is my hope that we can act in a bipartisan way to find a way to implement cuts that can replace the across-the-board cuts that will do what, I believe, is irreparable damage to the Defense Department and our ability to defend this country.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, quote from Secretary Panetta, who said as recently as Monday, "If Congress fails to act over the next year, the Department of Defense will face devastating, automatic, across-the-board cuts that will tear a seam in the Nation's defense."

He went on to say, "The half-trillion in additional cuts demanded by sequester would lead to a hollow force incapable of sustaining the missions it is assigned." Furthermore, "the Pentagon's ability to provide benefits and support for U.S. troops and their families also would be jeopardized if the automatic cuts," as designed, "are allowed to go into effect."

Mr. Speaker, he ended his statement by saying, "Our troops deserve better and our Nation demands better."

I'd say to the gentleman that it is my hope that we can work in a bipartisan fashion to try and do that which eluded the supercommittee and the other efforts along the way this year to try and come up with the requisite cuts. Again, I hope that we could do so and make sure the cuts are there, not avoid the cuts, but also not allow them to eviscerate our ability to defend this country.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I appreciate Mr. Panetta's quote. I believe Mr. Panetta's quote is an accurate quote and, I believe, substantively correct.

Let me give the gentleman another quote from the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen. I know the gentleman knows Admiral Mullen, who served so ably as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

He said, "The most significant threat to our national security is our debt."

He went on to say, "And the reason I say that is because the ability for our country to resource our military—and I have a pretty good feeling and understanding about what our national security requirements are—is going to be directly proportional—over time, not next year or the year after, but over time—to help our economy."

So I would agree with the gentleman that we need to reach a bipartisan agreement. I would hope the gentleman would share my view that we need to reach a bipartisan agreement on a big deal. A little deal, as the Speaker and I have discussed, will simply push off until next year a decision and the year after in just doing it incrementally. That will not give confidence to the markets. It will not give confidence to

the business community. It will not help our economy either domestically or internationally.

So my concern, I tell my friend, is if we now walk away from the sequester, as we have walked away from too many agreements in the past, we will again remove the discipline, remove the incentive, remove the imperative, as the gentleman points out, for coming to a bipartisan agreement, which is Bowles-Simpson, Rivlin-Domenici, the Gang of Six.

As the 100, the 40 Republicans and 60 Democrats, as the 46 equally divided between Republicans and Democrats have said, we need to reach a balanced deal: a deal which will restrain and cut spending, a deal that will deal with entitlement sustainability over time, and a deal that will provide a revenue stream that will allow us to fund what we believe to be absolutely essential, of which, as the gentleman points out, and he and I agree, national security is one.

□ 1240

So I would hope that we would not walk away from that disciplinary incentive to, in fact, have Republicans and Democrats come to an agreement.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, no one is talking about walking away from fiscal discipline, and I share in the gentleman's desire to try and address the real problem here, which is Washington spending.

As the gentleman knows, the Republican majority in the House has the only plan on the table that actually is a big deal that fixes the problem. Unfortunately, there's just not an agreement on those very big issues.

As I've said and indicated earlier, there have been at least three attempts this year to chase the so-called big deal, and the problem is there's no agreement. There's no agreement on doing what's necessary to fix the real problem. And so if we've been there—and the President, himself, has said that there may be some issues that have to be disposed of or resolved in next year's election, but it doesn't mean we can't make some incremental progress.

I disagree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that somehow if we make some progress, that that somehow takes away from our ability to solve big problems. We have already demonstrated around here the bar is pretty low when it comes to fixing big problems, and that's unfortunate, but it doesn't mean that we can't work incrementally together to address priorities.

I'm with the gentleman. I know that the response from the markets and otherwise are not going to be as positive if we don't fix the problem through a so-called big deal. But the point of contention is, one, the unwillingness to fix the real problem, because it's we in the majority that have put forward the only fix, long term, as CBO would say; and then the other point of contention

is we don't believe that now is the time to raise taxes on small business men and women.

And it's not the millionaires and billionaires; that's not the point. We don't believe that when you want to grow the economy, when you want to create jobs, that we should be putting a higher burden on the small business people of this country to create the jobs we want.

So if we know that there's that divide—we have already seen it play out for 8 or 9 months—let's try to work incrementally together in a bipartisan way, the way most people do that have differences, come together where you can set aside the differences.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think that both sides have shown some flexibility in some respects. Certainly a number of Republicans and Democrats showed flexibility on the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

Now, none of the House Members on the Republican side showed that flexibility, for reasons that I've heard them articulate. I understand they had reasons. But, unfortunately, we didn't get to the 14 votes in a bipartisan way on the Commission. As you know, I was not on the Commission, but I supported the Commission's report, would have voted for the Commission's report, as did Mr. DURBIN, the majority whip in the Senate.

Let me say to the gentleman, with respect to small business, nobody wants to put taxes on small business. As a matter of fact, we want to reduce taxes for small business. We offered that on the floor in the United States Senate yesterday. Every Democrat but one voted for that yesterday. Unfortunately, it did not pass. Your side, as you know, offered an alternative, an alternative which didn't even enjoy the support of the majority of your party.

So we need to get to bipartisan support, but I wish the gentleman would, when we talk about trying to ask some of the wealthiest people in America to pay a little more—not a lot more, but a little more—to meet the obligations so our country is fiscally sound, would not keep putting forth this, what I believe to be, windmill of small business.

We are for small business. This tax cut would reduce substantially taxes on small business. Your party, the majority, voted against it in the United States Senate. It hasn't been brought to the floor.

We would hope that we would extend the tax cut for middle class working people and not restore that tax, and that that would affect both individuals and, as the gentleman knows, small business. So we have a tax cut that we're recommending. The President has gone all over the country and talked about it, but it hasn't been brought to the floor. We think that's regrettable. We would hope you would do that.

Furthermore, frankly, the millionaires' tax, the billionaires' tax is, as

you know, a net taxable income level. It's not going to hurt small business at all. It's not going to hurt job creators at all. And, very frankly, I will tell my friend, we continue to follow an agenda which I don't think you can quote me an economist that will tell me that your regulatory bills that we've been spending time on, day after day, week after week—which I know sounds good to your people. We need regulatory reform. We need regulatory simplification. We need to make it in America. One of the ways we need to do so is make it profitable to make it in America. I agree with that 100 percent. But I don't have any economist who has told me that that's going to create jobs. As a matter of fact, Bruce Bartlett, an economist for the Reagan administration and Bush administration, said specifically it will have little, if any, effect.

Do you have an economist who said that that's going to grow jobs?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to some of the gentleman's questions, first about Bowles-Simpson.

I think maybe some of the position that was taken by the House Members on Bowles-Simpson reflects the fact that it didn't fix the real problem. Again, it didn't fix the entitlement problem we have in this country given the demographics, and so that's the real problem.

And so if you don't fix the real problem and you go raise taxes, which the Bowles-Simpson plan suggested and gave you options to do, it's like throwing good money after bad. And I think the American people are tired of it. We have to fix the problem, and that's what we want to do.

And as far as the sequester is concerned, I want to reiterate that we're not talking about, and I'm not suggesting, on not doing all the cuts, because we believe—and this is the change that we put in place here when we became the majority. We believe you shouldn't be raising the credit limit of the country without turning things around and stopping the spending.

So we're not talking about or not suggesting not doing all of the cuts. What I am saying is we need to work together to find the commensurate cuts that aren't those that disproportionately affect the defense of our country. And I think the gentleman agrees with me; a priority is the defense of our country.

That's why if we can't see our way clear to even finding \$1.2 trillion through the Joint Select Committee process, then let's look to see how we come together in an incremental way. But I think the American people are looking for some progress here.

But I want to tell the gentleman, again, I don't believe that raising taxes is a good thing. And, again, the gentleman continues to talk about balanced deals, and that is a euphemism for saying raising taxes.

But, look. If we disagree on that, if the gentleman thinks it's good to raise taxes, then we have a disagreement. So let's, instead, focus on areas where we can actually find common ground, and the common ground should be, as the gentleman suggests, on small business.

Now, every economist there is will tell you that uncertainty, that added costs will provide an impediment to job creation. Now, I'm sure the gentleman has visited small business people in his district like I have in mine. And the kind of regulatory measures that we brought forward, whether it's regulations being proposed by the EPA, those being proposed by the NLRB, or any of the other measures, the ones that we passed on the floor today, these are measures to remove the uncertainty of added costs to our businesses, our small business men and women. Today's measures and this week's measures went to the fact that we need some common sense put back into the regulatory process.

□ 1250

We want to make sure that agencies take into consideration their actions and the consequences that those actions have on small businesses. We want to make sure that the agencies are going through a cost-benefit analysis that's a balanced and sensible approach. And yes, I think you will find agreement among economists, if you've got that kind of certainty, you will lend the process towards a better economy to create jobs, and I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I take from his comment, however, that he doesn't have an economist who has said that these bills are going to grow jobs. I agree with him that economists certainly believe that over the long term certainty is a good thing. We all agree on that. I hope all of us agree on that, and I would like to accomplish that. That's one of the reasons I'm for a big deal.

But let me give you a quote from Ben Bernanke as it relates to your saying we want to raise taxes. Nobody wants to raise taxes. I will tell my friends, I've been in office now for a long period of time, some 40-plus years. It takes zero courage, zero courage, to spend money and not pay for it. We believe we ought to pay for things. That's the difference.

Taxes are the money we collect to pay for things: taxes that we collect to pay for our national security, taxes we collect to pay for researchers at NIH, taxes we pay for FBI agents to protect us from terrorists, both domestic and foreign. Those are what our taxes are. Taxes are to help our kids get a college education so we can be competitive in the international community. It's paying for things that we're for.

And I will tell my friend, I'm glad to see you come to the point where we're going to pay for things because very frankly, as the gentleman knows, we're collecting revenues at a far lesser rate than your budget asked to spend, than

your budget, the Ryan budget, which, as you well know, did not balance the budget within the next 20 years and was all on the cut side, and the gentleman well knows was not a viable document. It did pass the House of Representatives; it did. I'm not sure it would have passed the Senate even if the Republicans had been in control of the Senate.

But notwithstanding that, let me give you a quote from Ben Bernanke because I agree with you—and you and I have talked about this privately, and we're now talking about it publicly. We ought to come together. We ought to sit down. We ought to reason together. We ought to be courageous together. We ought to have the will to address the extraordinarily dangerous fiscal crisis that confronts us.

Ben Bernanke said this: We aim to push our elected leaders to face the Nation's long-term fiscal challenges with civility, honesty, and a willingness to sacrifice their own reelection. This means not kicking the can anymore. That's why, if we abandon the sequester, that will be kicking the can. If we abandon trying to get a big deal, that will be kicking the can. This means—as he said—means reaching a deal on debt, revenue, and spending long before the deadline arrives this fall. Well, it came and it went and we failed. It means considering all options from entitlement programs, and the gentleman knows I've given a number of speeches on having to deal with the entitlement programs. We need to do that, but we also need to deal with taxes and revenues so we pay for what we buy, and we ought to tell the American people we can't buy that if you don't want to pay for it.

Now, very frankly, I think in the short term, given the economic crisis, lack of jobs, and the struggling economy, raising additional revenues in that timeframe, as Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin both said, is not good policy, and they would not propose that, and it has not been proposed, as the gentleman knows. But I would tell my friend that paying for things—and as the gentleman knows, one of the reasons we've gotten into this problem was we didn't pay for things in the last decade. We have bought a lot of stuff, and we didn't pay for it. We asked our children to pay for it because it's a delayed effect.

We didn't pay for the wars, and we didn't pay for the prescription bill, and we didn't pay for the tax cuts. Simply giving up revenue, voting for tax cuts, and continuing to buy things is, frankly, I think not only not courageous but it is a disservice to this generation and generations yet to come.

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and the gentleman asks what regulations did we put forward, bills removing impediments in the regulatory process. Well, I mean the Keystone Pipeline, look at that bill. That bill says we'll create 12,000 construction

jobs right away if we can remove the necessary government redtape getting in the way of that project. So I don't see that there's any disagreement over that, but somehow we have your side saying that we shouldn't do that.

And if the gentleman is so interested in paying for things—because I don't believe that that's an issue now because we're not saying remove the sequester. What we're saying is finding cuts elsewhere but imposing that discipline. But if we're talking about not paying for things, what about the stimulus? My goodness, that was an 800-plus billion dollar effect at the end, didn't pay for anything, and it ended up imposing all kinds of debt now on us and our children and theirs.

And so I am with the gentleman: let's be courageous. Again, our budget was put out there. In the joint select committee process, our side proposed a plan to come together, and I think that the gentleman knows on his side there were comments made that there was never any coalescence on the part of the Democrats as to a way to come to some solution.

So I'm for the courage, but seemingly, after looking at the three processes that have taken place, the Biden talks, the White House talks, and those between the Speaker and the President and the leader on the other side of the Capitol, as well as now the joint select committee, all of those did not come to a result. So if that's the case, let's then say, well, wait a minute, maybe something's not working here. Then let's try and see what can work and what can't work. We really can come together in a bipartisan way and find some things that we agree on. Let's set aside those big differences, and the President even suggested back in the spring those big differences may get in the way. So, fine, let's find a way for us to at least make some progress because some progress is better than none. So incremental progress is better than no progress. That's for sure.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment, and I agree with it. Some progress is progress, however you describe it.

Let me clarify, because I want to make sure in terms of coming together and reaching some progress; you mentioned the—I'm not sure that every Republican agreed to it, maybe the gentleman knows, but there was—Mr. TOOMEY put a proposal on the table which offered \$300 billion in additional revenues. Of course, that was offset by an \$800 billion increase next year in tax cuts or a net reduction of \$500 billion in revenues for next year, excuse me, for January 2013.

Let me ask the gentleman, in reaching that, the gentleman mentioned entitlements. I agreed with him on entitlements, but the gentleman then said he's not for any increased revenues. All three of the bipartisan commissions, the two commissions and the Gang of Six, all three have said that revenues must be part of that picture. That's

taxes—a fancy word for taxes. Does the gentleman agree with that, because that certainly was the basis for bipartisanship in all of three of those fora?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, I'd say to the gentleman, I think our side has demonstrated—we've put forward a number of plans, both in these processes that we're talking about and in the joint select committee, as well as with our budget. And I think we come from the perspective, Mr. Speaker, let's fix the problem. If you don't fix the problem and then you want to raise taxes, especially on small businesspeople, you are throwing good money after bad and you're aggravating the crisis that is gripping this country right here and now as well, which is the jobs crisis.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I would say, let's agree to work towards common ground. We have laid out very well several times where differences are, but it's time for us to really work to transcend those differences and work in a bipartisan manner and see where we can come together. We've done it. We've done it in the House on the trade agreements. We've done it in the House on the 3 percent withholding bill. We've done it in the House when it comes to the veteran hiring bill. We can do this. Now, yes, it's not everything that all of us want, and I share the gentleman's frustration.

□ 1300

The gentleman has been here a lot longer than I have. But I will tell you I think the gentleman's career has been built on progress. So let's work towards progress again. That's all.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I didn't get an answer to my question, however. He's gotten an answer to his "solve the problem" issue. And what he means by solving the problem is we have to deal with the sustainability of entitlement programs. I've adopted that premise myself in speeches that I've given on numerous occasions on this floor and in other fora around the country.

What I'm asking him is, does he also agree—that proposition was adopted by all three of the fora that we have discussed—does he also agree, as Mr. Bernanke points out, that revenues, or taxes, however you want to call it, resources to pay for what we believe are priorities—for instance, the gentleman correctly believes we need to invest in our national security. I feel very strongly about that.

For 30 years I have voted on behalf of the national security of this Nation—to pay for it and to pursue weapons systems, personnel levels, strategies to assure our national security. So I have no qualms with saying that is a priority. If it is a priority, if it is important, it is important to pay for it. Paying for it is through revenues. If we don't pay for it, if we borrow—we're going to borrow over a trillion dollars to protect our country in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places around the

world, but particularly those two. That's important. That's important to do. He and I agree. But I think it's important to pay for it and not have my children and grandchildren pay for it, who are going to have to pay for their security in their time. And if we leave them only a legacy of deep debt, they will not be able to do so. That is an immoral policy, in my opinion, as well as a fiscally irresponsible policy.

So I ask my friend, I understand we've got to fix the problem. What you're talking about is make sustainable demographics of change, costs of change. We have to make sustainable entitlements. But does the gentleman agree that a component of the solution has to be dealing with revenues as well?

Mr. CANTOR. We've always said, certainly, there needs to be more revenue. But we need to be focused on how we can have a sustainable revenue flow, and that's from a growing economy.

The gentleman asked me before whether we have economists that will endorse our Republican jobs-creator agenda. And, yes, the Speaker, as he knows, has issued a letter with 132 economists listed on that letter. And I'm going to send it to the gentleman so he can be reminded yet again that, yes, there are plenty of economists who embrace the notion that if we take away the impediments that Washington has put in place, that we can see a growing economy and produce more revenues.

I would say to the gentleman about his assertion about fixing the problem, he's correct, we need more revenues. We believe we need more revenues. Let's first see if we can fix the problem, because just paying for things by raising taxes doesn't fix the problem.

We know the demographics of this country. We know 10,000 people every day turn 65 and become eligible for Medicare. We know that Medicare is supported by premiums and taxes paid in. And those revenues cover only a little over half the cost of the program. We know that means that every day times 10,000, you're 50 percent in the hole. You cannot tax your way out of that. You can't grow your way out of that. You've got to fix the problem.

Back to my original notion. We're the only ones that have put a real fix on the table to that problem. And so what the gentleman says is, No, no, no, we don't want to fix the problem; we just want to tax people more until sometime, somewhere we come up with a solution to fix the problem. That's like throwing good money after bad. And raising taxes on small business people is going to get in the way of getting more revenues into Washington because you're not going to spur the economy into a growth mode.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have been over and over this for months. We know where our differences lie. Let's come together.

I would say Keystone pipeline: again, the gentleman has a lot of support on

his side for the unions in this country. They want to see the Keystone pipeline built. Twelve thousand new jobs right away—almost 13,000 construction jobs. We've got manufacturing jobs and spin-offs that will come from that. Why can't we come together on jobs?

So, again, we can do this. We really can. It's time for us to begin to work together towards a productive end. Let's get America back to work, get this economy growing again, and then maybe we can then tackle some of the bigger problems that have eluded us in this quest to try and accomplish it all that has failed this year.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

We ought to come together on jobs. I would urge the gentleman to bring the President's jobs bill to the floor with such amendments, such changes, such improvements, such deletions as the gentleman feels necessary.

The President put out a jobs bill which every economist has said will grow the economy, will grow jobs; and it has been languishing in this House since September while people are losing jobs.

Now, the good news is we had some improvement in the economy. By the way, the Recovery Act worked, as the gentleman knows. I want to comment on his going into deficits as a result of the Recovery Act. As the gentleman knows—and he voted for—George Bush suggested \$700 billion in unpaid spending to staunch the financial crisis brought on by the meltdown on Wall Street in September of 2008, when President Bush was President. He offered a bill. He didn't offer to pay for that. And we didn't pay for it.

You and I both voted for it because we thought it was the responsible thing to do to stabilize the financial structure of this country. I believed we were absolutely right at that point in time. It was a very unpopular bill but, nevertheless, I think absolutely essential.

So in terms of some 5 months later, confronted with the deepest economic crisis since Herbert Hoover, we acted. We acted with the Recovery Act. And the Recovery Act has worked. It was not as big as some asked it to be, but it created some 2 million jobs over the last 36 months. It has not been as robust because we lost 8 million jobs. So if you add 3 million back, you lose 8 million, you haven't gotten to where you need to be.

But I tell my friend that we ought to come together. We ought to reach agreement. We ought to reach a balanced agreement. Your side thinks when we talk about balance, we're talking about revenues. He's right. But when we talk about balance, we're also talking about fixing the problem the gentleman talks about. We're talking about a balanced deal.

I would urge my friend in these coming few days that we have left, where we're apparently going to do either a CR or an omnibus appropriation bill—and we were criticized greatly for not

doing every appropriation bill individually. You have an appropriation bill, as the gentleman knows, that hasn't even passed subcommittee much less full committee or the floor of the House. But we need to get those bills done because it will give certainty and confidence to the American people that we can work together. I'm hopeful that over the next few days that we can, in fact, do that.

I would urge my friend to let us keep the discipline of the sequester in everybody's mind because we don't want that alternative. But we want to have that as the alternative to people so that we can give incentives to work together to summon the courage, to summon the judgment to reach an agreement which will get our country on the right track and give our citizens the confidence in their government that we wish they would have.

But they will only have it if we do, as the gentleman suggests, come together and work constructively toward a balanced package not only in terms of a fiscal package, but appropriations.

Let me say as well on appropriations, this side of the aisle did what your side of the aisle didn't do over the last 4 years when we were in charge. We made sure those bills passed. Your bills had your levels that we agreed on. And we congratulate you on sticking with the agreement we reached. I will tell my friend we will do so again if you do not put in the riders that Mr. BOEHNER and your Pledge to America said ought not to be in must-pass bills.

You will recall, I'm sure, that Mr. BOEHNER said we ought not to have extraneous controversial items which are not germane in bills that must pass. We ought to consider those on their merits. And I will tell my friend that if you do that, as the whip, as I have done on the two CRs we passed, on the debt limit extension we passed, and on the omnibus, or the "minibus" that we just passed, I will help you get those through. We will work together, and America will have greater confidence in us if we do that.

I yield to my friend.

□ 1310

Mr. CANTOR. I just want to thank the gentleman, and I look forward to working with him over the next 2 weeks.

I just want to clarify, no one is talking about removing the sequester, absolutely not. The gentleman knows where I stand on that. I'm talking about making sure that we come together to find the cuts commensurate with those aimed at the Defense Department, and in lieu of those cuts, putting others in place so we can maintain our priority of the national defense of this country.

Mr. HOYER. I will assure the majority leader that we will maintain our flexibility on schedule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
DECEMBER 5, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

You know, for folks who aren't accustomed to seeing what you and I just saw, I think that's quite a treat. In about—what does it turn out to be? In about 45 minutes, we've had the majority leader for the Republicans and the minority whip for the Democrats lay out in intricate detail the differences that we're facing here as well as the commonalities that we're facing here. That hasn't happened in a little while. It was a little more spirited today than it sometimes is as they come down on Friday afternoons to share with each other what the schedule will be going forward, but that's always a treat to see, and I hope folks enjoyed being able to be a part of that.

What I have on my mind today is twofold. We're talking about jobs. All day, every day in this body we're talking about jobs. And much like you saw the majority leader and the minority whip lay out competing opinions, competing views of what America should look like going forward, we have competing views about what creates American jobs. And I will tell you that, Mr. Speaker, we sometimes spend too much time talking about the creation side that we ignore the destruction side. Because it's absolutely about creating jobs, but it's so much easier to stop killing jobs.

Creating jobs, we can disagree about how to make that happen—lots of different proposals on the table—but destroying jobs should be something that we agree today should never happen, should be something that we say day in and day out we're not going to let happen. And that's the case as we talk about energy independence. Energy independence.

I'm going to quote my Georgia colleague, Jimmy Carter, Mr. Speaker. He was giving a speech in 1979. He said: "In a little more than two decades, we've gone from a position of energy independence to one in which almost half of the oil we use comes from foreign countries at prices that are going through the roof."

Sound familiar? Mr. Speaker, does it sound familiar? This was a speech

given in 1979. "In a little more than two decades, we've gone from a position of energy independence to one in which almost half the oil we use comes from foreign countries at prices that are going through the roof."

I'll tell you what else my Georgia colleague, President Carter, said: "I am, tonight"—in his 1979 speech—"setting a goal for the energy policy of the United States. Beginning this moment," he said, "this Nation will never use more foreign oil than we did in 1977—never."

Hear that. The speech given in 1979 by the President who created the Department of Energy, whose sole mission was to wean the United States from foreign oil and create domestic capacity to meet all of America's energy needs, not just because of jobs but because of national security is what the President said. "Beginning at this moment, this Nation will never use more foreign oil than we did in 1977—never."

Well, sadly, that has not come to fruition, and we're going to talk a little bit more about why that is.

Quoting again from President Jimmy Carter: "From now on, every new addition to our demand for energy will be from our own production and our own conservation. The generation-long growth in our dependence on foreign oil will be stopped dead in its tracks."

Folks, this is President Jimmy Carter—I would argue one of the more liberal Presidents that we've had in our lifetime—from my great State of Georgia. I'm going to be one of the most conservative Members that we have in this U.S. House of Representatives, and I agree with absolutely everything he said. I was 9 years old when he said it: never use more foreign oil than we use at this moment in 1977; every new demand for domestic energy will come from domestic energy production.

Who disagrees with that? Who disagrees with one of our most forward-thinking, energy-independent Presidents that we've had? Who disagrees?

Let's move forward. Let's look at U.S. oil consumption. 1973 to 2004 are the numbers I brought down today. This top line, U.S. oil consumption. U.S. oil consumption. Here we are in 1979 when the President was giving his speech: All the new demand, he said, will come from U.S. energy supplies.

The red lines are oil imports. Red line is the amount of oil that we are bringing in from overseas. Here's the President's speech in 1979. Here's that peak year in 1977. He was giving the speech in '79, but he said let's look at 1977, a peak year for our imports across the globe. We will never import that much oil again.

Well, look out there. Look right out there, 1996, 1997, 1998 through today, we absolutely are. And why? And why? The why is because of U.S. oil production.

You know, we talk—and again, you saw it with the majority leader and the minority whip. When they were talking

about their competing visions for a direction for America, they were talking about jobs. And the minority leader asked, he said: Name one economist who will tell you that reducing regulation creates jobs? That was an honest question. Name one economist who agrees that reducing government regulation creates jobs.

Folks, look at the Gulf of Mexico. Look at the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. Speaker, you know as I do, as you are from that part of the world, that America's largest shallow water oil drilling company declared bankruptcy in the midst of some of the highest costs per barrel of oil that the world has ever seen. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker, would a U.S. oil producer, the largest in the country, declare bankruptcy when the price that we're getting for a barrel of oil is among the highest in world history?

□ 1320

I'll give you the answer: Because the United States government wouldn't give them a single permit to drill. Hear that. More oil imports from around the world than ever before in American history, focus on both sides of the aisle on creating jobs, and the largest shallow water oil producer in America goes out of business because the American Government won't give them permits.

Tell me, who believes, Mr. Speaker, that that didn't cost jobs, that that regulatory decision to refuse to allow Americans to drill for American oil in American waters, as they have for decades, who believes that didn't cost us a job?

Now, good news. Good news. Those rigs that we would have been using to drill for American oil, they're not being moth-balled. They've just gone overseas to drill for foreign oil that we'll then be able to pay top dollar to get back in America.

Folks, why? Why?

This is an energy independence issue, and it is a jobs issue, and it is a national security issue.

Look back: 1980, after President Jimmy Carter's speech that said we will never import more oil, importing, here, six million, almost seven million, barrels a day.

Fast forward, 2008. That number's almost doubled to 13. It's almost doubled to 13. Folks, we're rich with energy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, you know, as I do, we have been blessed. There are countries around this world that don't have access to fresh water. We do. There are countries around this world that don't have access to beaches and to mountains and to waterways, and we do. There are countries around this globe that don't have access to energy, but we do.

Mr. Speaker, who is it who decides that we can't harness U.S. energy? Who is it? Is it some sort of natural law of nature that says we can't harness U.S. energy?

No. It's the folks who sit in these chairs. It's the folks who sit in these