

once again increase deficits and debt, which in turn will be used as the catalyst for another round of cuts to the very programs I believe are vital to our economy and to our people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose an unpaid-for tax extenders package like this that is proposed, should it come to the floor.

Before going through my concerns about this deal in greater detail, let me say that the package being discussed has a number of tax preferences that I and many others support. These include making permanent expansions of the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit launched under the Recovery Act in 2009. It would also provide incentives to businesses and individual filers for investment, research, charitable contributions, and teaching expenses, among others. Most of us support those efforts.

In many ways, this would be a bill where everyone gets something they want. But, Mr. Speaker, our children and grandchildren will get the bill.

What concerns me most about this deal is that it further entrenches the false notion that offsets only matter when it comes to spending priorities. The direct consequences will be providing Republicans with the ammunition they need to propose even deeper cuts to the very investments that help grow the economy and create jobs both in the short term and in the long term.

Frankly, I am surprised that we haven't heard more of an outcry that the roughly \$800 billion in lost revenue from this package is nearly the same amount as the \$813 billion in discretionary cuts Republicans insisted upon in the sequester. It would appear that we are setting ourselves up for Republicans demanding the next round of severe cuts that harm our economy and our people, both on the nondefense side and on the national security side. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we must move away from this dangerous pattern.

Republicans have continued to argue that tax cuts pay for themselves by spurring economic growth, a theory that has been proven wrong, and, sadly, as I said, our children will pay the price for the deficits that have resulted. Others will argue that the effect on our deficits and debt of another \$700 billion in unpaid-for tax expenditures over the next 10 years can be ignored because we would extend them every year anyway. While convenient, neither of these is a responsible position for governing.

In a *Wall Street Journal* piece last Monday, Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—asked: “How do we explain to our children that we borrowed more than \$1 trillion—counting interest—not because it was a national emergency or to make critical investments in the future but because we just don’t like paying our bills?”

Our answer has to be not to justify the irresponsible behavior, but to correct it. And this tax extenders package will make that much more difficult. First, this package undermines Congress’ ability to invest in creating jobs and opportunities that make the American Dream possible for millions of families.

When we cut taxes without paying for them, there are consequences. Every dollar in lost revenue is a dollar that must be made up somewhere else in the budget. As I said earlier, these unpaid-for tax extenders will set the table for further Republican attempts to slash critical investments in our Nation’s future.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it will hinder our ability to restore fiscal stability by making it less likely that we will be able to protect the future sustainability of entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

In order to appear balanced, recent Republican budgets proposed trillions of dollars in cuts to health programs for seniors and the most vulnerable in our society. Worsening our deficit outlook by passing this bill invites them to continue that tack.

While we face a challenge to our most critical retirement and health programs—a challenge driven by the retirement of the baby boom generation and the looming effect of compound interest on our debt—my Republican friends continue to offer budget proposals that severely cut benefits for seniors and the most vulnerable Americans and they try to justify doing so because our deficits are too high. Their proposal would exacerbate that by about \$1 trillion, as Maya MacGuineas said. Here we are, though, about to consider proposals to raise the deficits even higher.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, this type of unpaid-for, permanent extension will undercut our economic competitiveness by making comprehensive tax reform more difficult to achieve, not easier. We need comprehensive tax reform, and this will make it more difficult. Locking in preferences while lowering the revenue baseline by more than half a trillion dollars will ensure a plunge into further debt.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that the business community would much prefer to see rates go down through comprehensive reform than simply an extension of individual preferences. This bill promises them both—more preferences and lower rates—at the cost of deficits, debt, and diminished investment in our economic competitiveness.

There are certainly components of this tax extenders package that I, as I said before, would like to make permanent. I wish we could make them even better, in fact. For instance, the child tax credit should be structured to keep up with inflation so those working the hardest to get by don’t continue to see their resources dwindle year after year.

Again, let me quote Maya MacGuineas when she highlighted this

important point in her op-ed when she said: “Most of the extensions under consideration are sensible enough policy—and their merit is an argument for paying for them.”

I couldn’t agree more. This tax extenders package, itself, serves as a powerful argument for Democrats and Republicans to come together to achieve that which we really need: comprehensive tax reform.

So, in closing, Mr. Speaker, while I agree we need short-term certainty for tax filers before the end of the year, I believe the price this package would have us pay is too steep and too irresponsible in the short term and in the longer term. Instead, we could provide that same immediate certainty with a simple 2-year extension. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to think carefully about the long-term impact and consequences of this tax extenders package on the ability to create jobs and opportunities, grow our economy, invest in strengthening our security, reduce our Nation’s debt, and balance our budget.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congress and our people expect us to do better. We have a responsibility to our country and to our children to do better. Let’s do it.

□ 1215

#### ANDERSON TRUCKING: A MINNESOTA SUCCESS STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Anderson Trucking Service for their impressive 60 years of business.

The founder of Anderson Trucking, Harold Anderson, grew up in the transportation industry and began hauling granite with his father. In those early years, Harold developed a strong interest in machinery and driving. So it was no surprise when he chose to pursue a career in trucking.

Harold officially started Anderson Trucking Service after he returned home from World War II. The company is now run by Harold’s sons, Rollie and Jim, as well as his grandsons, Brent and Scott.

Over the years, Anderson Trucking has grown and prospered, but the Anderson family has never forgotten their roots. The company and the Anderson family represent the best St. Cloud and central Minnesota have to offer. The customer service of Anderson Trucking is only matched by the community service provided by the Andersons and their great employees.

Today Anderson Trucking has thousands of rigs, hundreds of drivers, and has driven millions of miles. The Andersons, however, do not just measure success by the number of miles driven or the number of deliveries made, but also by the high level of the customer service that the company provides.

For the past 6 decades, this international transportation company has successfully and safely delivered freight to their valued customers.

We look forward to seeing the continued success of Anderson Trucking for this generation and generations to come.

Congratulations on your first 60 years.

PREFERRED CREDIT, INC., EMBODIES MINNESOTA NICE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Preferred Credit, Inc., of St. Cloud, Minnesota, for winning a Torch Award for Ethics from the Minnesota Better Business Bureau.

Preferred Credit was established in St. Cloud in 1982 and quickly realized their goal of becoming one of the preferred finance companies for the direct sales industry throughout the United States. This outstanding Minnesota company accomplished this goal by giving their clients the best possible customer service and building strong, personal relationships.

The way Preferred Credit achieves success is evidence of how deserving they are of this award. The Torch Awards are meant to recognize companies that go above and beyond for their customers, employees, vendors, and community.

I would like to congratulate Preferred Credit, Incorporated, for receiving this prestigious award and for representing what Minnesota is all about.

Thank you for everything you have contributed to the St. Cloud community and to the great State of Minnesota. We would not be where we are today without great businesses like yours.

THE BACKBONE OF MINNESOTA SMALL BUSINESS AND AMERICA

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss overregulation.

Chair of the Federal Reserve, Janet Yellen, recently said that small community banks really are suffering from regulatory overload. I absolutely agree.

Community banks and credit unions are struggling with excessive and overly burdensome regulation.

Today 17 of my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee and I sent a letter to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, better known as the CFPB, regarding the most recent addition to the pile of regulations harming consumers and community financial institutions, the newly revised Regulation C.

Regulation C requires most banks and credit unions to collect new personal data on loan applications beginning January 1, 2018. This regulation essentially doubles the current requirements triggered by Dodd-Frank.

The CFPB, without adequate justification of need, now wants personal information, including business or commercial information, property values, property addresses, credit scores, and interest rates. This appears to be a

government agency fishing expedition that should raise serious concerns relating to our personal privacy and liberties.

This significantly higher regulatory hurdle means community financial institutions will have to allocate more of their limited resources to deal with Washington's red tape, rather than providing loans to families and businesses in Minnesota.

It is my hope that the CFPB will exempt small community financial institutions from this new burden, or we will have to work to draft legislation that will help our small community banks in Minnesota because, as I often say, Mr. Speaker, what is good for Minnesota is good for America.

#### JUSTICE FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and I stand in the well of the House as a proud American.

I love my country, Mr. Speaker. Because I love my country, I have tried not to forget those who go to distant places, those who go into harm's way. They do it because they love the country. Many of them do not come back the same way they left, Mr. Speaker. They are the men and women who serve in our military. I never want to forget the sacrifices that they make.

Today I want to salute and honor them for the many causes that they have taken up and for the many times that they have left their homes and their loved ones to stand up for liberty and justice for all, to make real the great American ideals, and to provide us the safety and security that we have today.

But I also stand here today in the well of the House, Mr. Speaker, to announce my solidarity for justice, my solidarity with the Muslim community for justice, because I understand what it is like to be a part of a community that is treated unjustly.

I lived through segregation in the United States of America. I know what it is like to go to the back door. I know what it is like to drink from filthy "colored" water fountains. I know what injustice looks like. I have seen its face. I know what it smells like.

I have been in waiting rooms where only Blacks could sit. They were for Blacks only because there were other places for others. I don't want to see anything like that, similar to that—anything that is remotely similar—occur to someone else.

I am standing here today in solidarity with the Muslim community because of the injustice that is being perpetrated against Islam.

I am a Christian. My grandfather was a Christian minister. But I stand here to support Islam today, one of the great religions of the world. I do this, Mr. Speaker, because to demean Islam by adding the word terrorist with it is an injustice to the religion.

Islam is a peaceful religion. No religion condones the taking of innocent lives intentionally. Let me repeat this. No religion condones taking the lives of innocent persons intentionally.

This is why I am here, because I want to make it clear that Islam does not condone this. We should not be talking about Islamic terrorists. Why not call them what they are: people who commit dastardly deeds. If you do it in the name of a religion, that doesn't make what you do a part of the religion. People ought not be found guilty by their affiliation with a religion.

What these people are doing—ISIL, al Qaeda, Daesh, ISIS, any name—is evil, and we ought to call it such. It is not Islam. We ought not, as a result, decide that we are going to bar all members of the Islamic faith from this country. That would be wrong, Mr. Speaker. To even consider it is something that I find repugnant: barring all people because of their faith.

The Islamic faith is not—is not—the motivating factor behind all of this injustice that we see perpetrated by ISIL. They can claim what they want, but the members of the faith have spoken up.

In Houston, Texas, we met just recently and discussed this at length. Every Muslim in that room denounced what was being perpetrated and perpetrated by ISIL, by ISIS, by any name—evil. We ought not do this to a great religion.

I stand for justice, and I stand for justice for the Islamic faith. I believe that persons who are in harm's way in Syria and in other countries ought to be given an opportunity to escape harm.

I believe that the Good Samaritan was right. The Good Samaritan didn't ask: What will happen to me if I help this person who is in harm's way? The Good Samaritan posed the question: What will happen to him if I don't help him?

That is the question we have to ask ourselves as it relates to our brothers and sisters. They are our brothers and sisters because there is but one race. That is the human race.

One God created all of humanity to live in harmony, to quote Dr. King. But the question we have to ask is: What will happen to them if we don't extend the hand of friendship?

The Good Samaritan went so far as to take the person to a place where there was shelter, where the person could receive some attention, and said to the innkeeper, if you will: Extend me a line of credit. If this person needs more than what I can give you today, I will come back and I will take care of my line of credit.

We owe it to ourselves, as a great leader of the world, the world leader, to make sure that we extend justice to Islam.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of the persons who were in attendance at the meeting.