

Doyle (PA)	Levin	Royal-Allard
Edwards	Lewis	Ruiz
Ellison	Lieu (CA)	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	Lipinski	Rush
Esty	Loebssack	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda
Fattah	Lowey	T.
Foster	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sarbanes
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schakowsky
Gabbard	(NM)	Schiff
Gallego	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	Maloney,	Scott, David
Grayson	Carolyn	Serrano
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Green, Gene	Matsui	Sherman
Grijalva	McCollum	Sires
Hahn	McDermott	Slaughter
Hastings	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Speier
Higgins	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Himes	Meng	Takai
Hinojosa	Moore	Takano
Honda	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Napolitano	Titus
Israel	Neal	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Torres
Jeffries	Norcross	Tsangas
Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vargas
Kaptur	Pascarella	Veasey
Keating	Payne	Vela
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Velázquez
Kennedy	Pingree	Visclosky
Kildee	Pocan	Wasserman
Kilmer	Polis	Schultz
Kuster	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Langevin	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Welch
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lawrence	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Chu (CA)	Gutiérrez	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Lee	Young (AK)
Duckworth	Lofgren	
Engel	Nanula	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1143

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall No. 65—no; rollcall No. 66—no; rollcall No. 67—no; rollcall No. 68—aye.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Jack Nicklaus.

□ 1145

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because I was detained on congressional

business yesterday, I inadvertently missed a vote on rollcall No. 62, the amendment offered by Mr. CONNOLLY. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on that.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

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

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected around noon.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider S. 1, the Senate Keystone bill. After 6 years of waiting, this bipartisan bill, which will create more than 40,000 jobs, will finally be placed on the President’s desk. I do sincerely hope he considers his longstanding veto threat and sides with the American people by signing this important jobs bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider two critical tax packages next week that will provide much-needed certainty for Americans and small businesses.

H.R. 644, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act, sponsored by Representative TOM REED, will make charitable giving tax provisions permanent. This will also include provisions authored by Representatives ERIK PAULSEN, AARON SCHOCK, and MIKE KELLY.

Together, this package will make a real difference in the lives of Americans by encouraging donations of property for conservation and enhancing deductions for food contributions for those in need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 636, America’s Small Business Tax Relief Act, sponsored by Representative PAT TIBERI, with additional provisions authored by Representative DAVE REICHERT.

This bill is essential to creating stability for our Nation’s best job creators, small businesses, by making increased expensing permanent.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information he has given us. I have some questions on that information, but before getting to the bills that we are going to consider next week, I note the absence of the Homeland Security bill.

That continues to, unfortunately, be mired in controversy, Mr. Speaker. It is a bill that I would remind our Members, Mr. Speaker—and I know the majority leader knows this—has been agreed to, essentially.

There really is no controversy with respect to the funding of the Homeland Security Department. There are no amendments being offered to change the numbers or anything of that nature.

There is, however, the holding hostage, Mr. Speaker, of this bill for the purposes of overturning the President’s actions which, in our view, he was forced to take because of the inaction of this body after over a year of even considering the comprehensive immigration reform bill that the Senate passed by over 60 votes, with almost two-thirds of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, voting for that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned and the American people are concerned that a bill which is so critically important for the defense of our borders, for the security of our country, and the security of our people is languishing, notwithstanding the fact that we have agreement on the underlying bill. There is no disagreement in my view.

The Homeland Security bill, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would pass with over 400 votes if it were brought to this floor, but for the fact that it is being held hostage to force the President to do something that the Senate clearly has indicated they are not going to approve.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority leader to bring to the floor a clean bill. By clean, I mean the Republican-reported bill—not our bill, but a compromise bill—a Republican-reported bill in December, conference—conference may overstate it because it was the four leaders, Republicans and Democrats meeting—and they brought out of that meeting to this floor a Homeland Security bill that could pass overwhelmingly.

Every day that we delay puts us closer to the February 27 deadline that was set in December for the funding of this bill, taken out of the omnibus appropriation bill that we passed, put on a short-term leash, putting our homeland security at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Majority Leader, I would ask you: Is there any plan at some point in time to say we are not going to snatch defeat from the jaws of compromise?

The leader knows. The leader is very astute. He understands this body very well and knows full well that the underlying bill has consensus.

If there is anything that is frustrating the American people, it is that when we have something that we agree upon, we turn it into something that we can’t agree on.

I yield to my friend, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of telling me what his view is as to when we are going to be able to pass an appropriation bill to ensure

that the Homeland Security Department can operate in an effective, efficient manner to protect America and Americans.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I share the gentleman's frustration. Knowing the timeline of dealing with funding of Homeland Security, Republicans want to make sure it is funded. That is why we took up legislation. I agree with the gentleman. Why is it being held hostage by the Democrats in the Senate?

As my good friend knows, the Senate has changed hands. In watching what has happened on Keystone, you get open debate. I know you didn't have amendments for the last number of years, but now, you have the opportunity.

If people disagree with the House bill, all they have to do is take the bill up. As my good friend knows, what is happening in the Senate day after day is the Senate Democrats are voting now to allow the bill to come up. If you disagree with the bill, you can't offer amendments, you can't change the bill.

I would say to my friend: I share your frustration. I think our direction should be at the Senate Democrats and getting them to allow the bill to come up because nobody wants Homeland Security not to be funded. That is why we took the bill up very early, so the Senate could have time.

It is unfortunate that they play these actions in a time and place—as you said, the American people want to see this done, and we want to see it done in a bipartisan manner as well.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, Mr. Speaker, but, frankly, the American people ought not to be confused. There is a bipartisan agreement. We did not send, however, the bipartisan-agreed bill to the Senate.

We did, as we so often do, add to a bipartisan agreement something that does not have agreement, and that undermines the ability of this Congress to work on behalf of the American people in an effective way.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader knows that. He knows it because I have had discussions with him. He knows it because, publicly, the President has said, Democrats have said: We don't agree with the provision you're adding to something that has been agreed upon in a bipartisan fashion by the Senate and by the House.

The majority leader knows full well that if we sent a clean bill that has already been agreed upon by the Appropriations Committee in the House, by the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, by Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee in the House and by Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee in the United States Senate, already agreed to—now, let me, Mr. Speaker, read you some comments by someone who I had a great opportunity to serve with in this Congress.

Secretary Tom Ridge—the first Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, a Republican—and Michael Chertoff, who was also a Republican Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, joined with Secretary—now president—Napolitano. The president wanted great educational institutions in our country; she was then Secretary and former Governor of Arizona.

All three of them said:

Funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration.

Again, I remind you that this is Secretary Ridge, former Republican Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the former Republican Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; and Michael Chertoff, former Republican Secretary of the Homeland Security Department; as well as Secretary Napolitano.

They said:

It is imperative that we ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is ready, willing, and able to protect the American people. To that end, we urge you not to risk funding for the operations that protect every American and pass a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

I agree with Secretary Ridge. I agree with Secretary Chertoff.

When my friend says, "Oh, it's the Senate," I disagree with my friend. It is the Senate who has not passed a bill. Of course, complaining about the 60-vote requirement after having required the most number of cloture votes in history in the last Congress by the current majority leader of the United States Senate when he was minority leader is a little difficult to understand. I choose my words carefully on that.

The fact of the matter is we are putting at risk the security of the American people. We have seen in Canada, we have seen in France, and we have seen in the Middle East horrific terrorist acts. This Department was created to prevent such acts.

By God's grace and their work, America has been very fortunate since September 11, 2001.

□ 1200

The Secretaries are saying don't put that at risk.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge once again not only the majority leader but the majority party in this House to accept the fact that we do not have agreement on immigration.

I accept the fact that they believe the President has acted incorrectly. What I do not accept, Mr. Speaker, is that they are holding hostage the budget for the Department of Homeland Security in order to make their point on immigration. I would hope that the majority leader would urge his side of the aisle to not do that.

I close on this particular issue with this quote. When asked what was going to happen when time ran out on February 27 on this funding of the Department of Homeland Security, JOHN

MCCAIN, former Presidential candidate on the Republican side of the aisle, former Republican Member of this body and now the Republican chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the United States Senate, said this when asked what was going to happen on February 27. He said: "Your guess is as good as mine."

What do you think our adversaries think when, on the Department of Homeland Security, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee says: "Your guess is as good as mine"?

He goes on and says this: "I believe in one fundamental principle; that is, we cannot shut down the Department of Homeland Security."

Unfortunately, the Republican whip, my friend, observed that, well, we maybe just can do that.

Now, the theory is, Mr. Speaker, that because it is funded out of fees and because they are critically important employees, that we won't shut down the Department in one sense. But in another sense, we will preclude it from being empowered by the bipartisan bill passed out of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, and which we considered in December, to perform its duties.

I will yield to my friend, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to make an additional comment. If not, I will go on to some of the other legislation that needs discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding because I listened a long time.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate it.

Mr. McCARTHY. But you also very well know, the votes in the Senate that just took place for the last 2 days were to bring the bill up. And that quote you gave from JOHN MCCAIN? He is frustrated because he would like to get on to the bill.

There are two different Chambers. If it is, as you say, a strong bipartisan vote over there, the only people holding up bringing this bill to the floor are the Senate Democrats. It is unfair to claim anything other.

They have denied for 2 days straight. If they want to make an amendment, if they want to change the bill—but they deny the American people the chance to even bring the bill up.

So let's be honest with the American people on where we are because nobody on this side of the aisle wants Homeland Security in any trouble.

We passed the bill early. We sent it to the Senate early. For 2 days in a row, the majority has asked to allow the bill to come to the floor, and for 2 days straight, the Democrats have said "no," not even to debate it. That, to me, is unacceptable.

If you have a difference of opinion, you debate the opinion. But to deny the American public the chance to have that debate, that is unacceptable, and I will not stand for it.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to hear the majority leader will not stand for it.

Over a year ago, the United States Senate passed, overwhelmingly, a comprehensive immigration reform bill. The reason they are holding hostage the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Speaker, is because they don't agree.

But the majority leader has just said, Bring it to the floor. Let us vote. Let us offer amendments. We have asked that the Senate bill on immigration reform—which the House Republicans apparently don't agree with but on which the overwhelming majority of Americans in polling are saying yes, they agree with it.

So the majority leader complains about a bill not being brought to the floor. The minimum wage bill is a very, very important bill that the overwhelming majority of Americans support. In five States on which it was on the ballot, it was passed, in some red States and, yes, some blue States, mostly red States, by the way, and there is a refusal to bring it to the floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the majority leader complain about not letting that bill come to the floor, the majority leader knows, and everybody in this body knows, that if that bill should squeak by the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President. And I guarantee the majority leader, that veto would be sustained here.

I would remind him the reason the Secretaries say bring a clean bill to the floor, your Secretaries, as well as one of mine on our side of the aisle, the reason they say that is because they know that what I say is absolutely correct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I tell the majority leader, who is my friend and whom I have great respect for, that complaining about not bringing bills to the floor, we all need to look in the mirror, because if the issue is comprehensive immigration reform and you don't like what the President is doing, bring a bill to the floor.

Show us what you want to do. Let us vote on it. Send it to the Senate, see what they do, and then if they pass it, send it to the President.

But don't hold hostage the Department of Homeland Security. Don't put Americans at risk. Don't turn a bipartisan consensus agreement into partisan gridlock, which the Americans hate, and which puts them at risk.

I will go on to other matters, unless the majority leader would like me to yield to him one more time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would ask that you yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

We were talking about looking into the mirror. Twenty-two times the President said he did not have the power to take the action that he did. From the time he said that to the time he took that action, what changed? The Constitution did not.

I will remind the gentleman, because he was at the lunch that I was at with the President. I reminded the President, after the election but prior to being sworn in, we had this discussion with him, with Senate and House leaders.

The President had the opportunity, when you were majority leader, he was President, and the Democrats controlled the Senate, to deal with immigration. They did not.

We asked the President: Would you even give us 1 day in the majority to deal with it? He did not.

So when we look into the mirror, I will gladly look into the mirror because I think the idea should win at the end of the day.

But if the Senate Democrats will not even allow you to bring the bill up to debate, I think it is very hard for your argument to stand ground.

This is a time that we want to make sure Homeland Security is funded. We took the bill up early. Just as the Constitution says, the House has their position, the Senate can have theirs. It doesn't say whatever the Senate says they can and cannot do we should just follow. No, we should lead, and we have. And I look forward to solving this problem before the 27th.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Is the gentleman prepared to bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And if you looked at our committees, we are working on it, just as we say this body should. It should go through committee, have debate on both sides, and be open.

I believe this immigration system is broken, and I think that is the process we should take, not the action that the President took.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, but I would observe that we have spent the first 4 weeks considering an awful lot of legislation that didn't go to committee at all—no hearings, came right to the floor through the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confounded by the representative of the majority party complaining about what the Senate Democrats have done and saying we are not for this bill when, more than at any other time in history, his party did that in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are other pieces of legislation I am concerned about. Let me ask the leader, if I can, with respect to the apparently seven bills which the Ways and Means Committee has considered, are those bills going to be considered, Mr. Leader, seriatim, one by one? Or is the expectation, as apparently I think I am reading in the comments you made, going to be packaged? And if so, does the gentleman know how many bills are going to be in which package and how many packages there are going to be?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman brought up about how we bring the bills to the floor, the gentleman remembers that there was a bipartisan agreement toward the end of last year with the Senate and with the House. It gave greater certainty, and it was going to be into one package.

Unfortunately, the White House disagreed, so we did not get that work done. In essence, it got stopped, saying it was too big.

Our intention next week is to bring them up individually, have the opportunity for the debate, listening to the White House. Whether they want a bill too big, too small, I am just trying to get the American public moving forward, so I took that advice and did it individually.

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

There are six or seven bills. Does that mean we will consider each one of those individually?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, they will be in the two packages.

Mr. HOYER. In the two packages. I know that it is usually the practice in both bodies, or in both parties, not to have open to amendment. Is that your expectation, that neither of the packages will be open to an amendment?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for asking. You asked a question similar to this last week.

It is always my intention to yield to the Rules Committee their jurisdiction to decide on the format of the bill coming to the floor and the number of amendments, whether it has a structured rule or an open rule. That is their job, and as soon as they make that decision, I will notify all.

Mr. HOYER. Same question, same answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Consistency.

Mr. HOYER. When I get an answer, I will stop asking. How about that, Mr. Speaker?

In terms of the deficit, I know your side is very concerned about the deficit. My side is very concerned about the deficit, and I certainly am very concerned about the deficit, as the gentleman knows. I have worked in a lot of ways to try to bring this down.

One of my propositions is that we need to pay for things. Whether we spend money or reduce revenues, we need to offset that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any intention to offset that so we do not exacerbate, make the deficit worse?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know you are concerned with the deficit. I am very concerned, especially with this administration adding more debt than all the other Presidents combined. That is why we are trying to spur the economy.

I firmly believe that if government takes less, that is more in the hands of

the public, and they are able to spend, and more revenue will come in, and history has shown that.

So I firmly believe that our actions taking place will actually bring greater revenue, greater job creation, and help lower the deficit.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I can't help but observe, however, that this President inherited the deepest recession that you and I have experienced in our lifetime and, as a result, we had to respond to that. We responded to it vigorously.

Unfortunately, it made the debt worse, but what it also did was grow our economy better and faster than any other economy on Earth. We now have an economy that is growing, creating jobs, 58 months solid.

We have increased, however, the debt by about 70 percent—too much. I will tell my friend, he may not know this. That is a percentage of GDP that—under Ronald Reagan, who could have vetoed every spending bill, the debt increased by 189 percent, almost three times as much.

Now, in real dollar figures, it is easy to say that, like saying \$7.25 is much higher than the minimum wage of 1968, when actually it is reduced to 46 percent of its purchasing power.

So the numbers, per se, but as a percentage of our wealth, as a country, this President has increased the debt, having to respond to the deepest recession since the Depression, almost about a third of what Ronald Reagan saw in his Presidency, the increase of our debt as a percentage of the GDP.

□ 1215

I would tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to come together, work together to make sure that this country is on and remains on a fiscally sustainable path, and I look forward to working with him toward that end.

But if we pass tax bills, as we did in 1981, 2001, and 2003, and pretend they are going to pay for themselves, it doesn't happen. We know it doesn't happen. And we look at it, and it doesn't happen.

Frankly, many of us on this side are for a number of the bills that are going to be in these packages. Some of us will be constrained to vote "no" because we don't want to make the deficit worse.

If the gentleman has a comment, I will yield to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This has been the slowest recovery. If you compare the recession during Ronald Reagan's time and how fast we came out of it, there is no comparison.

The participation rate in America today is 62.7 percent, the lowest it has been since 1978. When you give up on participating, you give up on your future; you give up on your dreams. That is not an economy that we want.

When you look at the tax package that we are bringing forward, charitable contributions, maybe people on

your side of the aisle think government should solve that problem. I see charitable contributions back home in my own community solving a lot of problems locally very fast and very direct. And I think these are things that could be bipartisan, so I look forward to it.

As you talk about the deficit, yes, I want to work on it. I looked at the President's budget. I do not believe government needs an 11 percent increase. That is how much new in taxes that he would give to the Federal Government. I think people keeping that would be better. And I think that lowering how we spend our money here in Washington would go a long way, and I welcome the opportunity to work with you on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Just so that the American people are clear on the record, Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan, about whom the gentleman spoke, didn't get to 5.6 percent unemployment until his eighth year as President of the United States. And he did not confront nearly as deep a recession as this President inherited from his predecessor, in which 4 million people had lost their job in 2008 and 878,000 people lost their job when he took office in 2009. So it has been a tough time.

But the good news is—not the bad news—that we have increased our economy faster, better, and more sustainably than any other country on Earth. That is good news, and we ought to tell the American people that is good news.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2015

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING DANIEL REID SIMPSON

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Daniel Reid Simpson. Unfortunately, on January 24 of this year, he lost a courageous battle with Lewy body dementia and went on to meet his Maker.

Senator Simpson, as many of us knew him, was a father and a husband to Mary Alice for some 63 years. He served the State of North Carolina in the State senate for six terms.

It was not just his service to our great State that made this man truly a remarkable example of a community servant. One of his proudest accomplishments, as he would tell it, was in-

troducing the bill and shepherding it through the State legislature to set up Western Piedmont Community College.

Additionally, he helped set up the Glen Alpine Recreation Foundation. In 2007, they honored him for that work by naming the field the "Simpson Field," for not only the recognition of his great work for the kids of that community who wanted to play baseball and football, but also for his life-long commitment to the folks of Burke County.

Senator Simpson also served in the military. He fought with MacArthur's forces in the Philippines and served in the occupation forces in Japan.

Not only was he of service to our great State and our great country, but he was of service to Burke County and to his family. So it is with sadness, but certainly with great honor, that I remember his life.

Our prayers are with his wife, his three children, and all of his family at this time.

REFORM OUR TRADE POLICIES

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the millions of high-quality jobs this Nation has outsourced over the last quarter century because of flawed free trade deals. These job-killing deals, like NAFTA, have been incredibly harmful to the American economy, racking up a massive, massive trade deficit of \$9.5 trillion. And they have failed to live up to the promise of creating jobs. Instead, they have wiped out good jobs, high-paying jobs across our country.

Take Motorola Solutions, for example, which shut down plants all over our country, from California to Florida. Motorola shut down those operations and moved production to China, to South America, to Eastern Europe.

Take Walgreens, which has outsourced its information technology operations to Mexico, to India, leaving its Illinois employees jobless.

Meanwhile, 6 years after the recession, Ohio and 14 other States have job markets that have not yet recovered from the number of jobs during the recession. Hundreds, thousands, millions of quality, good-paying manufacturing jobs have not returned. Citizens of these States, like Ohio, are fighting for honest employment.

Since 1976, America has literally outsourced 47.5 million good jobs. We have a budget deficit because we have a \$9.5 trillion trade deficit.

We must support job seekers. More lopsided trade deals are not the answer. We simply have to reform our trade policies.

IN MEMORY OF FRED STOLLEY

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