

of materials that could easily be used as staging areas for violence against our country.

The most tragic of all are the young people who had been killed or who are now in jail, many of whom I knew and took care of as a family physician. Unfortunately, we, too, have one of the highest murder rates per 100,000 in our country. Our community was shocked a few months ago when two of our young policemen, who were in a high crime area but who were on what seemed to be a routine patrol, were shot earlier this year. Both sustained injuries which go beyond the physical. One is paralyzed and will require life-long care and support.

Our community, though, is fighting back. Our law enforcement has been meeting with those from across the Caribbean region. We are working with the Federal law enforcement that does exist in the Territory. Both of us, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, are high-intensity drug trafficking areas. We have a well-integrated but still incomplete team led by Adjutant General Vicens from Puerto Rico and Executive Director Catherine Mills from the Virgin Islands, but we do need more Federal help in order to restore the safety of our communities and to protect the lives of our children. This is not only important to my constituents and me; it is critical to the well-being of the constituents of all of our colleagues but especially to those whose communities have high homicide and violent crime rates.

In this legislation, which I am pleased to cosponsor, we are pleading for this critically important help in order to bring the vital Federal resources to save our communities—to save all of our communities—and to protect our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1550.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands and the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

I urge the passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1550, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## SEQUESTRATION: THE DESTRUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 28 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a lot of hard work to do in about the next 3 months around this place. I want to talk tonight about a process that we have brought upon ourselves so that now we are faced with what, I think, could be one of the greatest catastrophes in the modern history of the United States—and that is almost the complete destruction of our military through a process called “sequester.”

We use a lot of big words around this House, and half of the people who sit in this room on a daily basis don't even know what it means, to be honest with you, but they know what the process does: across-the-board cuts at every level of government. The reality of these cuts is that, at least in the current makeup of our government and with so many of our expenses in this government being mandatory spending and what we call “entitlements,” the lion's share automatically falls upon the military, on the Defense Department.

Even more critical to this particular agreement, which was made in the earlier part of this year when we had one of our many shutdown-the-government risks that have come upon this body in the last couple of years, the White House with the President, along with the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, met to discuss how to keep from having a shutdown of the government and how to raise the debt ceiling so we could continue to operate this government. With everyone recognizing that there was a looming crisis from having spent more than we make for as long as we can remember, quite honestly, and, therefore, that we are now in a problem of debt which is drowning this Nation and the Members of this body wanting to address that, the discussion was about how we would do it.

They came up with a concept of a supercommittee. Most of you who keep up with current events know that we formed a supercommittee, the purpose of which was to come up with the cuts from the appropriate parts of this government so that we would reduce the spending of over \$1 trillion, thus starting ourselves down the road to fiscal responsibility. This is what we set out to do. It was an honest effort, let's be frank. It was an honest effort. Everybody, whether elected to do it or not, recognized that this was the issue that was before us. The question was how to do this, and they came up with this supercommittee.

They agreed that, if the supercommittee failed, then the process of se-

quester would replace the actions of the supercommittee. There will be a political debate that will go back and forth as to who killed the effort in the supercommittee; but wherever the fault may lie, the supercommittee failed. Those of us who were in this House asked about the sequester and looked at it and worried about it as the vote came up as to whether or not this was the right thing to do. We then asked the question of the leaders here, which I'm sure was asked on both sides of the aisle: So what happens if the supercommittee doesn't perform?

We were told sequester, which was the worst possible thing to happen to this House, and I think both sides of the aisle agreed with that. But don't worry, it has never happened. It never will happen. We will do the right thing. The committee failed.

It is almost August. Quite honestly, the number of legislative days left before the election can almost be counted on these two hands, and we haven't addressed how we are going to do this; but the folks who may most be affected have no choice but to address it.

The agreement that came out of the meeting between the President and the Congress was that roughly half the \$1.1 trillion number, I believe it is, would come out of the Defense Department and that the other half would come out of domestic spending. Well, the Defense Department being the Defense Department—and it cannot function without planning—is already planning what it would have to do in case this occurs.

We talk in big ideas and issues around here, but the reality is this: this is about a bunch of people who chose the profession for their lives, that of defending our Nation.

□ 2110

We should never forget that the ordinary soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and Coast Guardsman volunteered to join their branch of the service, most of them, as their profession. This is not the old drafted military of World War II or the Korean war or the Vietnam war or the Cold War. This is a volunteer military. This is a young man or woman saying: I choose the job of fighting for my country. This is what I choose to do with my life. I will earn my way. I will earn my promotions by being a good warrior.

My wife and I, when we first learned that we were going to have the honor of representing what we call a great place, Fort Hood in Texas, we wanted to meet with soldiers, and the place we could find them to meet with us around Thanksgiving time was in Korea. We went and met with Fort Hood soldiers in Korea. Most of them were from Texas at our table where they were talking to us, and I asked a question. I was new to getting to talk to the ordinary soldier. These were just ordinary soldiers. There may have been a couple of sergeants there, but most of them were not highly ranked.

I said, How long are you guys and gals going to be in Korea? They said,

Oh, 3 months, 6 months, whatever the time period was. I said, What do you want to do next in the Army? They responded, We want to go to Afghanistan or Iraq. This is back in '04. From someone of my age who has the memory of the draft Army, that was a shocking answer: We want to go from this place in Korea to the place where the war is, and we would like to go directly there. These were 19-year-old kids, kids like my son coaches in football and baseball back home. These were kids that could have been the same kids that played on the team the year before who were sitting there at the table telling us they wanted to go to war.

I was kind of taken aback by that answer. It was unanimous, by the way. There were eight people around the table that were all unanimous: we want to go to war. Then this young tow-headed 19-year-old soldier said, Sir, that's what we are. We're trained warriors. That's what we do for a living. We fight wars. We want to go where our country needs us. We want to go to war. Not because we like war, but because we are professional soldiers. We do this for a living.

This is the mindset that goes back in history a long ways. Some of the greatest armies in the world had that mindset, that this was the job they chose for their life. Now, because we have not been willing to live within a budget in the United States—we're all at fault, every one of us. The people in this House, both sides of the aisle, we're all at fault. We spend more than we make, and we wonder why in the world it doesn't work. How many people sit at home and look at their household budgets and say, My gosh, we're spending more than we make. No wonder it doesn't work. That's like the law of gravity. It's a natural thing that you can't spend more than you make and not ultimately be in trouble, even when you can take it out of other people's pockets like the government.

Now we are faced with a crisis, and we're talking about a solution for that crisis that's going to fall on the back of that 19-year-old kid that talked to me in Korea because his goal in life was to rise in the ranks by being a good soldier. As a good soldier, if he did a good job, he would be promoted and he would rise in rank. Maybe in his heart his goal was to some day be a command sergeant major of one of the commands in the Army, kind of the pinnacle of the career of an ordinary soldier. Because we spend too much and can't agree on how to cut it and we're going to have to go to automatic cuts, that young man's job is at risk. The President says he's going to protect the jobs of the soldiers. I hope what he means he's not going to fire anybody. Although one of the papers that I was reading an article in it said he's not going to cut the pay of the soldiers.

I happen to be blessed. One of the things that I'm very proud of in this body is I am a cochair of the Army Caucus here in the Congress, and I've

heard the generals talk about what sequester means to the Army. It means cuts of 100,000 to 180,000 soldiers. That means that kid that I talked to in Korea, who's probably now done three tours in Afghanistan or Iraq, who has done a good job, fought for his country, performed in an excellent manner, has been promoted, he's in the beginning of the middle of his career, and because we can't agree on how to reduce our runaway spending, that kid is going to lose his job.

He will not only lose his job, but he's going to lose his career. He chose our United States Army partially out of the job he wanted to do, but in a great many cases out of patriotism for this country. He didn't sign on to be in somebody else's Army. He signed on to be in our Army. He's done everything right; and yet because we can't control our spending, that young man and those young men and women at that table could lose their careers that they chose for their lives, careers to be proud of as Americans. There are young people willing to do this for our country.

When we talk these big numbers and throw around big words, we've got to remember it affects human beings. We've got some charts here I want to show you so you get some idea of what we're talking about. Where is the spending? This is entitlements. The spending is at \$26.1 trillion. Nondefense spending is at \$11.3 trillion. Defense spending at \$3.6 trillion. That's where the spending is in our country today.

Let's look at what we propose to do as a solution under sequester. From entitlements we're taking \$171 billion out of \$26.1 trillion. From nondefense spending, we're taking \$322 billion out of \$11.37 trillion. Over here in defense we're taking \$422 billion, the highest of any of these numbers, out of \$3.6 trillion. This is about a 42 percent cut. This is out of whack.

What's this out of whack going to do to our military? Let's start off with what we're talking about right now in the country. We're talking about our economy, we're talking about getting ourselves out of this slump we're in and putting Americans back to work. Does anybody think it's a good idea to create a program that loses American jobs? To me, I just can't fathom it. But according to CNN, 1 million jobs will be lost under sequester. That's not military jobs. That's the people who provide goods and services either directly for the military or sell it to the military.

□ 2120

And here is something else that's pretty frightening. As we look down the road at this sequester program, the law that was created by the Congress and which was signed into law says, if we anticipate the loss in an industry of jobs based upon the actions of this body, they have to pass out pink slips 60 days before that might happen and in some cases 90 days.

Well, the drop-dead date on sequester is January 2 of next year. So if we do nothing by January 2, we are going to have these across-the-board cuts. We are going to have 1 million people get pink slips in either October or November. Now, is that going to raise the enthusiasm for growing our economy in America? It is absolutely as destructive as it could be.

We have a responsibility to try to do something about this, and we can't keep kicking cans down the road in this body. If we do, one of these days, we are going to get a broken foot, and already there seems to be a brick in the can.

This is serious stuff. We've got real people's lives being affected in the military. We've got real people's jobs being affected in the defense industry. These are people who go to work, just like everybody else in this country. Somehow we hear the words "defense industry," and we assume some kind of fat cats. Go over to one of the defense industries and see the machinists and the guys that do all kinds of jobs, that create these great instruments that are instruments of war and also instruments of peace that we use in our military. All of these things are at risk, and the people who do those jobs are at risk right now as they relate directly to the sequester.

I am joined by my friend Mr. BISHOP from Utah. Would you like to jump in here and talk a little bit about this? You are on the Armed Services Committee, I believe.

We had 20-some minutes to start. So we are down to 10 minutes, I believe. Tell us your view from the committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas taking up this particular issue. I promise you, you will get a few minutes here to finish this one up here as well.

I will start just by moving off where we are for just 1 second and going back to my real love, which is still baseball. If you recall, back in 1962 they created the amazing New York Mets, a team that set the standard for ineptitude in professional sports. Anyone who wants to seek that, to fall that low, now has a perfect standard by which to judge your effectiveness in becoming bad.

The New York Mets, in 1962, lost 120 out of 160 games. That's the standard by which people now judge themselves. And it's amazing to think of how the leadership of the New York Mets could cobble together a team of athletes so inept at working together as a particular team, leaving such luminary names as Jay Hook and Ken MacKenzie, Choo Choo Coleman and Hobie Landrith there together.

Probably the best of all those names was Marvelous Marv Throneberry, a big first baseman who I think, in his third year with the Mets, actually hit a triple, which is amazing considering he's not really one of those fast runners. But as he was rounding the bases going to third, he missed second base, which was spotted by the opposing

team. So they waited until the play was back in, called for the ball, stepped on second base, and he was out.

Well, obviously Casey Stengel went running out there to complain about this and argued the case up and down and lost, and Throneberry was out. As Stengel went back to the dugout, he passed the first base coach, Cookie Lavagetto, and said, "Why weren't you out there at least arguing with me?" And Cookie looked at him and said, "Because he missed first base, too." And that was the end of the discussion.

Now, eventually, the management was able to take the amazing '62 Mets and turn them into the miracle '69 Mets that were the world champions. But the administration of the Mets had to do some fancy work to do that.

The situation we have right now is where we have an administration in this country that is doing that same kind of work that the Mets leadership did, except in reverse. We are going from the '69 Mets back to the '62 Mets, an administration that took over the best defense, the best military in the world and is, bit by bit, pulling it down to the form of mediocrity, even to the level of the '62 amazing New York Mets.

We have faced three potential cuts to the military. With the first one, then-Secretary of Defense Gates said, If you go beyond this first \$600 billion cut, it could have devastating effects. This administration took a second cut beyond it, and now what the gentleman from Texas is talking about is the potential for a third cut to the military.

Now, what has been the net effect of this administration's efforts on behalf of defense altogether? Well, for the first time, there are 50 major defense programs that have been canceled. This is the first time there is not a single aircraft modernization going on in this country. And if you consider the fact that modernization takes between 10 and 20 years to effect, that means regardless of what happens in November, this country is without a new modernization program for our aircraft for at least two decades after President Obama leaves the White House.

We were spending 4 percent of our GDP on military before this President came in. We're now down to 2.5 percent. That is the percent we have been complaining about our allies in Europe spending, and that compares to 6 percent under Reagan, 10 percent under Kennedy, 12 percent during Korea, 35 percent during World War II.

We have platforms in our military that are over 25 years of age and are not getting any younger. We have the smallest Army since World War II. We have the smallest Navy since World War I. In World War II, we had over 6,000 ships; today, we have 280.

We will have the smallest Air Force ever. Several years ago, two of our F-15Cs literally broke in flight and two F-18s caught fire while on the aircraft carrier. Our A-10 Warthogs have cracks in the fuselage. We only have one fifth-

generation fighter in production while the Chinese and the Russians have a combined 12 fighter and bomber lines open for business.

We are moving the defense of this country backwards into an area that is frighteningly fearful. We are going from the '69 to the '62 Mets when we should be trying to go in the opposite direction, and that's what happens before sequestration goes into effect.

If, indeed, we add the sequestration—a third cut on top of the other two—we will do what the Secretary of Defense has said: We will hollow out our military. We will put our defense at danger—not just the defense of this country but, as was previously mentioned, the jobs that are in the private sector—the military base, the industrial base that help us defend ourselves, and we will take away from the table the potential of foreign affairs options that we have.

Our ability two decades from today to conduct foreign policy is dependent on the decisions we make now to define and have an adequate military backup for what we need to do. These are the decisions we need to be making, and it is essential that we recognize what we are doing now is wrong.

To change and reverse our defense cuts even for 1 year would take \$109 billion. But, oddly enough, that is 1 month of borrowing that is being done by this administration.

We can't afford this sequestration as a country. And I find it sad that the President of the United States will actually say that he will veto any effort to get rid of these automatic spending cuts, using the defense of this country as a hostage in a high-stakes battle with Congress over what our future tax policy will be. That is not what a good administration should be doing. That is not what this country needs. We need to do something different.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas allowing me to rant a little on this particular issue. This is important to every American. This affects not just what we're doing today but what happens two decades from this day, when we are probably long gone from this body.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, and we may get a little more time, so don't run off.

What you just had to say was really important. That's the kind of shock that the American people need to hear. We are going to take the most powerful and the strongest military force on Earth and hollow it out. And when you ask a commander to explain a hollow force, he will say, On paper, it will look like a combat brigade; but when you go down into the various jobs that must be done to have an effective fighting combat brigade, you will find there is no one in those jobs. Therefore, it is not an effective combat brigade. This is simple stuff using just people as an example.

When you are using carrier forces and you are saying, We're going to

take out the carrier and all their supporting ships—so we're going to give up a carrier and its ships or maybe two carriers and its ships to meet this sequester—you gut the Navy.

□ 2130

You gut the way they deliver force to a fight. They are one of our major deliverers of force to a fight. We take their claws away from them. The long-range Stryker and our new ships that are coming online, that as I understand it—and I forget what they call that—but that is gone.

And the thing about the Air Force, my gosh, we have known for a long time, since I first came to this Congress, that we were behind the eight ball in developing the next generation of combat fighting aircraft. We were behind the eight ball. This is when I came in 2002 and the discussion I was having with the folks in those days, we are working on it, we have them on the assembly line, we are trying to finish them up, but we're behind the eight ball. The Chinese and the Russians already have the next generation of fighting aircraft, and they're developing more, just as you said. And yet, we're talking about ours are going to go away. You have much more experience with this than I do, but I think everybody has common enough sense to know that if you shut it down, bringing it back is going to take a long time. It's just that simple. It's complicated. It's not easy.

And then of course, if we're not going to reduce the numbers of our fighting force, we're going to reduce the way they go to battle because you've got to cut something in the Army. If you're not cutting people, and I don't know if that's what the President means when he says he's not going to go after the personnel, whether he means he's not going to lower their pay or he's not going to lower their numbers. I don't know the answer. But if they lower the numbers, this is the vehicle the next generation is supposed to go to war in. We're not going to have that vehicle to go to war in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair is prepared to recognize a Member from the minority party. There being none, under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) for the remaining time until 10 p.m.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. We'll try not to use it all so somebody can go get some rest around here for all the good work you people do here. But I am grateful to have a little more time so I can visit with my good friend, Mr. BISHOP.

That's what you've been saying to us here. And one of the things you hear around this House is, well, there's soft power. I've had debates with some of my colleagues that we don't use soft power effectively. We try to always use hard power. I would argue you can't

have soft power unless you've got hard power. All the sweet talk in the world, if you don't have somebody to back you up that you can ultimately punch them in the nose, it ain't getting you anywhere. And if we're taking the punch out of our military, what are we left with?

By the way, I think those young kids who are not getting the kind of history lessons they should get these days probably know from somebody telling them that the last time we took our military down to this level, we had an event called Pearl Harbor. And that shows what happens when your readiness is not ready. And this is a world full of very, very dangerous things right now. We've been looking at terrorism for the last 10 years, and terrorism remains a big, big problem for this country. But there are others who would do us harm out there that if we don't have the ability to defend ourselves, we could fall into serious harm's way.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman again, and I would just like to reiterate a couple of things that he has said and build on those points that are there. It is extremely important to realize that we are about the people's business, and we are doing the constitutionally required things that a Congress ought to do.

You know, we all say that it is significant, that we do have a problem with our budget. Which is true. We all recognize that. But there are certain core constitutional responsibilities that were given by the Founding Fathers to Congress to make sure that we maintained those responsibilities in those areas. The Constitution tells us that we have the responsibility to promote general welfare, which is nice. We probably don't understand what they meant by general welfare anymore, but we are to promote it. But we have the obligation to provide for the common defense. And that verb differentiation was not done by accident by those who wrote the Constitution. It is the mandate that this Congress has to provide for the common defense, not simply because it's a fun thing to do, but because it defends this country, and it provides our ability to do foreign policy in the future as well as providing some jobs for people who are necessary to make sure that this happens.

I reiterate what we said earlier. This sequestration is not a simple decrease or cut to the military. It would be the third major cut to the military. Remember, we cut, number one, \$600 billion, at which time the Secretary of Defense said you cannot go much more than that. And then this administration put another cut, number two, of \$400 billion. And now if sequestration were to go through, were the President to follow through on his threat to veto any legislation that would stop the sequestration, it would be cut number three of an additional \$600 billion. And that is what everybody who works with

the system says would destroy and hollow out our military, and we would be in violation of our constitutional obligations to provide for the common defense.

Now, I am actually fairly proud of the House. We have on several occasions sent legislation over to the Senate that would stop this process and make sure that this core constitutional responsibility we have is actually fulfilled by Congress and we do not let this cut number three, sequestration, go into effect.

Right now, they are sitting on Senator REID's desk. He needs to take up the responsibility of putting those to a vote and passing that legislation and putting this on the desk of the President, who needs to take up his responsibility as Commander in Chief and pass those bills and make sure that these devastating cuts, which as the gentleman from Texas quite correctly said, would hollow out our military, would be devastating to our military posture, not just for today, but for decades to come; make sure that those do not go into effect and those are properly signed by the President and properly passed by Congress.

The House has done our share. The House has done our responsibility. I need to call upon the Senate now to pick up the mantle and do their part of this effort to make sure that we defend this country, as we ought to.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out, and reclaiming my time, we've already done work to show the direction we can go to head off this absolute disaster for our national defense. It is in the hands of the Democratic-controlled Senate. It is in the hands of the majority leader in the Senate, and it is time for him to put the partisan politics aside and fund our military and make the cuts across other areas.

Let's keep to our word to make cuts. Let's don't break that word, but let's don't destroy the military and violate the Constitution, which says we are supposed to provide for the common defense of this country.

You know, sometimes we get kind of provincial in this country, so just for the fun of it, let's talk a little bit about all those jobs, who's going to lose those jobs.

Let me put that chart up here. Potential job losses across the board: California, 125,800; Virginia, 122,800; Texas, 91,600; Florida, 39,200; Massachusetts, 38,200; Maryland, 36,200; Pennsylvania, 36,200; Connecticut, 34,200; Arizona, 33,200; Missouri, 31,200. That's the top. That's the top 10, I think it is.

But the truth is the defense industry and those who provide for the defense industry are a major part of our economy. We're all going to feel this. But if you're one of those States, and you're already worried about where are your kids, when they get out of school, going to get a job with jobs being lost, look at that list and see that we're all in this together. As we make this crazy

move of weakening our national defense to the point of disaster, we're also weakening the very economy we're struggling to strengthen.

□ 2140

How can this possibly be good sense to anybody in this country? To me, it doesn't register. We're looking to create jobs, not destroy jobs. This is going to be a major impact on our country. I think we have the real potential to go back into a deep, double-dip recession and hopefully just being able to head it off at that.

Meanwhile, as these cuts take place and our military gets weaker and weaker and weaker, what do we do about the enemies of the United States? Is that where we want to be? Have we become that kind of country? I don't think so. I think we all need to gut up and put the politics aside. Let's don't hold hostage these jobs and hold hostage our military so somebody can get their tax policy different from someone else's tax policy. Let's debate that without holding anybody hostage. Let's debate it, let's vote on it, and let's get it done. Let's go to conference and let's work on taxes the way we're supposed to, but let's don't hold anybody hostage with threatening to destroy our military and get half the country laid off because we want it our way.

I would argue that that's exactly what HARRY REID is doing right now in the Senate. And I think that is something we need to stand up and shout on behalf of those warriors who go to war for us and who, by the way, have gone to war for us multiple times in the last decade.

This is exactly what Congressman BISHOP was talking about. We have a resolution that was sent over there, H.R. 5652. It replaces \$78 billion in defense cuts with \$316 billion in cuts over 10 years, and the cuts come from across the board—Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means—instead of all out of the Defense Department. And the committee chairmen of the committees in the House did the work, held the hearings, and came up with these solutions. This is how this place is supposed to work.

Now, why can't we let it work? Why do we have to play political games that hold the greatest defense in the world hostage? It's a crime. It's absolutely a crime not only to our institutions of the military, but to our individuals in the military who gave us 10 years of war and did it voluntarily. Not one of them was drafted into the fight. They all marched to war voluntarily. And some of them suffered horrendously on behalf of this country. They got promoted, and they were rising in the military; and with one fell swoop, because we refused to do it the right way, and the Senate wants to hold tax policy before the goodness of the Defense Department, these guys are going to

lose their jobs. And those people aren't in those unemployment figures. These are industry figures we're talking about.

But what about the guy that fought for you for 10 years and you've thrown him out of a job when he's been promoted? He may be a staff sergeant for all I know, that kid that I met in Korea almost 10 years ago. And yet do you know what? We're going to fire the kid even though he has been a good soldier. What are you going to do with him? He's got to find a new job and a new career. He chose defending his country as his career.

Through no fault of his own, but through the political will of the Senate, at least the majority of the Senate, he gets his job taken away from him, and he's out on the unemployment line. Something is bad wrong with this whole picture.

I'm not going to take all the rest of the time, Mr. BISHOP. I'll yield back to you if you have anything you'd like to say in conclusion, and then I'll wrap it up. I'm really grateful for you coming down here because your insight coming from the committee and hearing this day in and day out, I know you all have held numerous hearings on every issue, and I really appreciate your coming and sharing that with us.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I'm just grateful to the gentleman from Texas for actually broaching this issue. Jobs are important, but it's not just jobs for the sake of creating a job. This is a job that is essential for the defense of this country. This is our constitutional re-

sponsibility, and we need to take that seriously.

Sequestration is basically, as you said I think at the very beginning, it's not what was planned here; it just kind of happened. It was a failed policy that happened. Now is the time to actually become adults about this and recognize that sequestration will not only destroy jobs, but it will destroy the defense of this country; and our responsibility is to make sure we defend this country and give every capability that when we send somebody into harm's way they have the equipment that is necessary to make sure they come back successfully.

We don't want a fair fight. We want America to have the best equipment, and that flat out won't happen if we go through this big cut number three that we call "sequestration."

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to say something about this important issue, and I thank you for bringing it to the attention of the American people, sir.

Mr. CARTER. I think a good point that you've clearly made, "sequestration" should be a definition of our failure to meet our constitutional responsibility. And it just can't happen. So I want to end by encouraging both sides of the aisle and all my colleagues in this House, let's get this deal done, let's don't gut our military, let's come up with other solutions, and for goodness' sakes, let's don't sell out the people who have gone to war for us for the last 10 years.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of pressing business.

Ms. SUTTON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 27, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 5872. To require the President to provide a report detailing the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 on January 2, 2013.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 1, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JO BONNER, Chairman, July 9, 2012.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Chairman, July 10, 2012.