

So I say to you, right now, you're talking about a plan. PAUL RYAN said yesterday the Founding Fathers would be upset with the President for not coming up with a plan. The Constitution contemplates the President having very little, if any role, other than execution of the budget in the budget process. That didn't come until the last century.

The fact of the matter is it is our responsibility. Not a nickel can be spent in America unless the Congress authorizes it to be spent. The President can't spend money on his own. Not a nickel can be raised in this country, of revenue, without the Congress acting on it. The President can't do that.

It is the Congress of the United States, under article I, that has this responsibility. We're not taking that responsibility. We're trying to shove it off on somebody else, in this case, the President of the United States.

The President has a plan. He's offered it a number of times. I just read a book that discussed our discussions for some period of time with the President on his plan. He's sent budgets down here. Your side doesn't like his plan because it involves revenues.

There is not a bipartisan commission that I know of that has not suggested, in order to solve our debt and deficit problem, that we don't have to have a balanced plan, which will involve revenues and will involve cuts in spending, cuts in spending to entitlements, cuts in spending to discretionary spending. I agree with that.

I'll now yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, we just raised taxes. We just put more revenue in the mix, \$650 billion over 10 years, and got no cuts. No cuts.

And the gentleman talked about the 2001, 2003 tax cuts without paying for them. You know, we just extended most of those tax measures and relief to people under \$400,000 with no cuts. Nothing. So, again, I don't think it's right to be saying that we need more revenues now. We already did revenues, right? We already have \$650 billion.

Why does the gentleman continue to think, Mr. Speaker, that that's what we have to keep doing? It's not the answer.

Let's get to the problem that is causing the mounting deficits. It's a lack of growth, and it's the spending that's out of control.

Mr. HOYER. We're not going to resolve this argument, Mr. Speaker. It's the same litany on both sides. The difference is, the gentleman cannot name a bipartisan commission that doesn't say that we need both sides of the equation addressed if we're going to get from where we are to where we need to be.

On my side, we have to deal across the board with spending. You're correct on that. On your side, you're going to have deal with revenues. A lot of your people understand that, like Mr. COBURN and others. I won't mention

anybody on this side of the aisle because I don't want to get them in hot water, but they all understand that.

And what you're saying is, the Senate needs to compromise, the President needs to compromise by doing it your way. That won't work. Your way or the highway is not the way we're going to have compromise.

Mr. CANTOR. What about the revenues we already have now done? These are \$650 billion, Mr. Speaker, already raised, no cuts.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time if I can, the gentleman voted for the Budget Control Act. How much in cuts were in the Budget Control Act? \$1.2 trillion, as I recall, or \$1 trillion, excuse me, \$1 trillion, which is why we had the Supercommittee to get the additional 1.2 that the Speaker said he wanted.

So your side assumed that we'd already done a trillion of the \$2.2 trillion that the Speaker said was necessary. So the Speaker and your side, I presume, already adopted the premise that we'd cut \$1 trillion in the Budget Control Act.

Now, do we need more? I think the answer to that is yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, in his proposal, made some cuts. I'm not saying you should have supported it. I'm saying you should have allowed the American people to have that alternative on the floor to consider.

You say it wasn't germane. You and I both know—you know the Rules Committee process as well as I do—we could have waived that because the issue in front of us immediately—we're talking about the long term—immediately, is in 22 days, or 23 days, we're going to have a sequester. Almost everybody agrees that the sequester will have an adverse impact on the economy, and on our national security, and on discretionary programs because it would be irrationally done, across the board, without recognition of priority status.

So that I tell my friend, I regret that we're not dealing with the sequester. I would hope the gentleman would put legislation on the floor next week to deal with the sequester, deal with an alternative to the sequester, not talk about what we did last Congress. We didn't agree with that. You're right. We voted against it. But put something on the floor that deals with the sequester.

And I will tell my friend, I liked his speech. And he said again today he wants to work in a bipartisan fashion.

The fact of the matter is, we had an election, and in the election the American people said they thought the President's view had merit, which was a balanced approach. Yes, revenue, but also cuts in spending. And the Senate expanded its numbers, notwithstanding the fact that they agreed with the President's position and not with yours. And, in fact, more people voted for Democrats in the House of Representatives than voted for Republicans, but the redistricting resulted in your continuing to have the majority.

So we have a joint responsibility to get there. And I would urge the gentleman to please consider putting something on the floor, not these message bills, but putting something on the floor that will substantively deal with avoiding the sequester.

Now let me go on to another issue that I know that the gentleman's been working on, and that's the Violence Against Women Act. I know he's been working, he said, with Vice President BIDEN, who was very involved in this. Can the gentleman tell me the status of that piece of legislation?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows that my office and his have been in discussions about this bill. I have had daily meetings to try and get to a point where we can bring this forward. You know, I, as the gentleman does, care very deeply about women and the abuse situation, that we need to get them the relief that this bill offers. That's what we want to do. That's our priority.

We must move and act on this bill, and I've, as well, been in touch with the Vice President and his office about trying to assist in bringing the parties together because, as the gentleman knows, there's been the introduction of some issues that are not directly related to the situation of domestic abuse on tribal lands because that's what we're trying to get at. We want to protect the women who are subject to abuse on tribal lands.

And unfortunately, there are issues that don't directly bear on that that have come up that have complicated it, as the gentleman knows. But in working with his office, as well as the Vice President's, I hope to be able to deal with this, bring it up in an expeditious manner.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I thank him for his work on this as well. This is a critically important issue, and I am hopeful that we can come to an agreement which will provide for the passage of that piece of legislation and send it to the President. I thank the gentleman.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, February 8, 2013; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1240

PROMOTING MANUFACTURING AND  
A THRIVING ECONOMY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage this body to support our Nation's vital manufacturing sector by reducing burdensome regulations. Nearly 12 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the workforce—are employed directly in manufacturing. During last week's district work period, I had the opportunity to visit part of that workforce at the Tenneco facility in Hartwell, as well as the SKF Industries plant in Flowery Branch. I'm proud of the topnotch work being done by Georgia manufacturers. Companies like SKF have been recognized for the high level of investment the company places in employees. Last month, the Greater Hall Chamber of Commerce awarded SKF for its employee recognition efforts.

Manufacturing provides a great opportunity for folks, including those in Hartwell and Flowery Branch, to work hard and earn a good living so they can provide for their families. We cannot let their livelihood be threatened by out-of-control Federal regulations. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to promote a reasonable regulatory framework that will help manufacturing and our entire economy to thrive.

CELEBRATING PRESIDENT RON-  
ALD WILSON REAGAN'S 102ND  
BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 102nd birthday of Ronald Reagan, the 40th President of the United States. I take this opportunity to again thank Mrs. Reagan and the Reagan family for sharing their husband and father with this country. Their sacrifices allowed this Nation to move from an era of doubt and decline into one of a brighter future.

Today, we find ourselves facing another era of doubt and decline: chronic unemployment, staggering debt, international crises, and advocates of Big Government pushing for more failed Big Government to fix our problems. I suggest that those who think America cannot turn the state of affairs around to think again. As President Reagan said—and these words are inscribed at his final resting place in California:

I know in my heart that man is good. That what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life.

With that perspective, let us again renew our commitment with President Reagan's trademark optimism to a renewal of the American spirit and a re-lighting of the American Dream.

## PASSAGE OF THE FARM BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, without reforms, by the year 2020, the interest alone paid on our national debt by American taxpayers will cost \$1 trillion per year—money that could otherwise be used to educate our kids or put aside for those most in need. Most would agree that borrowing on the backs of our children to pay for promises our government cannot keep must end, and that only together, through the collaboration of both parties, can we assure America begins to live within its means.

During the last Congress there was one area where both parties came together. It was an effort that made improvements in programs resulting in better use of each tax dollar. It was an effort that also achieved deficit reduction. This effort was the farm bill.

Many of us are eager to hear the President's plan to help the Nation achieve fiscal balance during next week's State of the Union. I encourage the President to elevate passage of a new farm bill to the forefront of the speech. It's good policy. It's one area where we can come together and start the path of fiscal balance. I encourage my leaders in the House to welcome this call.

## HONORING LEE RUSH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true leader in my district back home in Pennsylvania, Mr. Lee Rush, who 10 years ago founded a community nonprofit organization known as justCommunity. Its mission is to provide consultation, education, and training services in the areas of youth development and substance abuse prevention, both very important goals.

In light of his exceptional efforts and initiative, Lee has been named an Advocate of the Year by the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America and will be receiving that distinction tomorrow, February 7. I couldn't be more proud of him.

Lee's achievements and steadfast leadership have positively impacted the youth and communities of Pennsylvania. It's been an honor to get to know Lee personally and to witness his accomplishments firsthand. I know that he will keep up the outstanding work.

## THE GLOBAL JIHADIST THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, outgoing Secretary of State Hillary Clinton recently issued a stern warning in her testimony before the House and Senate committees responsible for oversight of U.S. foreign policy. She referred repeatedly to the need for our country to recognize and respond to what she called a "global jihadist threat."

Mr. Speaker, rarely have I agreed more with Secretary Clinton. Yet if Mrs. Clinton has been worried about this threat before now, she has done an impressive job of concealing it. The same is true of the Obama administration more generally. For the past 4 years, the executive branch has gone to extraordinary lengths to obscure the danger posed by those who practice holy war, or jihad, against our country. The administration has also sought to silence, and in some cases punish, those who have spoken the truth about this menace.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely welcome the Secretary's warning, belated though it may be. However, it would have served this country and the cause of freedom far more if she had so openly recognized the threat posed by militant Islamic jihad—and to have led in countering it—at any point during her tenure other than its conclusion.

One of the most important architects of that see-no-jihad policy over the past 4 years has been John Brennan, President Obama's homeland security advisor and his pick to become the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In May, 2010, Mr. Brennan publicly declared that:

We do not describe our enemy as "jihadists" or "Islamists" because jihad is a holy struggle, a legitimate tenet of Islam, meaning to purify oneself or one's community, and there is nothing holy or legitimate or Islamic about murdering innocent men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, the unavoidable reality is that self-described jihadists have routinely gone about murdering innocent women and children for decades. It should alarm us all that neither John Brennan nor Hillary Clinton—nor seemingly anyone else in the Obama administration—has fully recognized the scope of this jihadist threat. They seem blind to the fact that the Islamic jihadists here and elsewhere in the West are even now engaging in a pre-violent form of holy war against infidels and the free world. And the administration has refused to face the incontrovertible fact that the driving force behind this practice is the Muslim Brotherhood. The brothers themselves call this form of holy war "civilization jihad."

Mr. Speaker, this reality is in direct conflict with the Obama administration's insistence—long-promoted by John Brennan—that we confront only al Qaeda and its affiliates. We are told that we can safely cultivate relations with "moderates" in Islamist groups like Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhood. This has led to helping