

Kildee	Neal	Schwartz
Kind	Olver	Serrano
Langevin	Owens	Sewell
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sires
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Levin	Pelosi	Speier
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Stark
Loeback	Pingree (ME)	Sutton
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan	Quigley	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Tonko
Maloney	Rangel	Towns
Matsui	Reyes	Tsongas
McCollum	Richmond	Velázquez
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Meeks	Rush	Schultz
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Moore	Sarbanes	Welch
Moran	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schiff	Wu
Napolitano	Schrader	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell	Hinchey	Payne
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Franks (AZ)	Johnson (IL)	T.
Giffords	Markey	Van Hollen
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield

□ 1211

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 533, the rule on H. Res. 340 appears to contain amendments which could be adverse to economic interests in the State of Illinois, subject to further study. The rule is traditionally a procedural, partisan matter. Accordingly, despite my presence on the floor in the center aisle, I chose to abstain. Had I voted, I would have voted, "present."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2109

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 2109.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for

legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

On Monday, the House will begin amendment debate on H.R. 2354, the Energy and Water appropriations bill; and consider H.R. 2417, the Better Use of Light Bulbs Act, under suspension of the rules.

For the remainder of the week, the House will consider H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011; H.R. 2018, the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011; H.R. 2434, the Financial Services appropriations bill; and potentially legislation relating to the expiring authorization of the FAA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as a scheduling notice, Members are advised that the House will now be in session during the week of July 18. I expect legislative business for the week to begin on Tuesday, July 19, at 2 p.m., with first votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. The last votes for the week are expected to conclude no later than 3 p.m. on Friday, July 22.

And I thank the gentleman.

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

I want to pursue what I presume is the reason for not having the district work period that was originally scheduled. My presumption is that we are concerned about the impending arrival of the August 2 date on which America would be put in the position of defaulting on its obligations. I presume that's the reason, that we want to make sure that we are here to work on that issue. Am I correct on that?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is correct.

It is my hope that we can have some deliberative processes and open discussions so that we can arrive at an appropriate conclusion of the challenges surrounding the issue of the debt limit expiration. That is correct.

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

I know the gentleman has said in the past that he believes it would be a very bad situation for our economy and for our country if we did not extend the debt limit.

Am I correct that the gentleman still shares that view?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that I have said before that America pays its bills just like the American people are expected to pay their bills at home and in their small and large businesses; but the fact is I think that the American people are expecting us to live up to the promise that we are not going to let spending get out of control again.

So the purpose of the deliberations that are ongoing throughout this Capitol, at the White House, et cetera, are focused—and should be—on making sure we change the system, on making sure that we accomplish the necessary cuts which would exceed the amount that we raise the debt limit, as well as to signal to the American people that we have changed the system; that this kind of unbridled spending ceases and

that we begin to live within our means and get the fiscal house in order so that we can focus on the overriding need for this country right now, which is to create an environment where jobs return.

I know the gentleman has seen today's jobs report. "Disappointing" is an understatement, so I make the point again:

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, he and I were at a meeting at the White House yesterday with the President in which I said, again, the import of our need to act and act responsibly and not—not—to raise taxes on the American people and the small businesses, and that we need so desperately to begin to create jobs again.

Mr. HOYER. I am pleased, as the gentleman knows, to hear that you want to stop the spiraling deficits that confront our country. I will repeat again because the gentleman keeps mentioning this, and I have enough experience to know what has happened:

In the 30 years that I've been here, of course we've had some few years of the Obama administration, but we had Mr. Reagan's administration, Mr. Bush I's administration, Mr. Bush II's administration, and we ran up—and I know the gentleman knows these figures—over \$6 trillion of deficit during that period of time. However, in the 8 years that Mr. Clinton was President of the United States, we had a \$62.9 billion surplus.

Now, the gentleman makes the point that spending is out of control. The fact is, as the gentleman clearly knows, when you were in charge of the House and the Presidency and the Senate, you increased spending by more than was increased during the Clinton administration by a percentage on an annual basis. So I'm glad to hear that your side now, without fail, talks about spending being out of control. Very frankly, I have the feeling, if your side were spending 5 cents, you would think that we would need to cut an additional 5 cents in revenues so that we could not pay the bills, because that's why we ran up \$6 trillion in deficits: you did not pay for what you bought.

Now, I'm one of those who very strongly believes we ought to pay for what we buy, but I also believe that we ought not to put this country on the brink of financial chaos and bring us down in the eyes of the world because we don't extend our debt.

Very frankly, I think we ought to pay for what we buy. We call that "taxes"—whether it's defending America, paying our FBI, paying people who are researching cancer, heart, lung, diabetes issues. Those are Federal expenditures for which the American people pay through taxes. If we are going to be responsible, we make a very simple judgment: if we want to buy it, we ought to pay for it.

That \$6 trillion of deficit was incurred during those Presidencies, and the President is the only person in America who can stop spending—the only one. You can't do it and I can't do

it. We need 217 other votes in our House. Over there, they need at least 60 votes to do anything. The President can do it himself. Ronald Reagan never had a veto overridden of a bill that said we spent too much money. George Bush I never had a veto overridden in which he vetoed a bill saying we spent too much money, and George Bush II never once had a veto overridden so that we spent money that he did not sanction.

So I say to my friend, we did meet at the White House, and the President of the United States, the leader of our party, and I and Mr. REID and Mr. DURBIN all said, yes, we need to get a handle on this spending; yes, we need to get a handle on the deficit; and, yes, we need to bring down the debt. We need to come to the table together with everything on the table, and we need to pay for what we think we ought to buy. Frankly, we ought to ensure that the United States of America, for the first time in history, doesn't fail to pay its bills.

□ 1220

I tell my friend that we've had a lot of commentary over the last few days, people on Wall Street, people in business—large, medium and small—and I will tell you that if the United States doesn't, by August 2, agree to pay that which it owes, that which it has incurred—not what we're going to incur, but those debts that we've incurred in the past—everybody in America is going to be hurt.

Every economist that I talk to says that interest rates are going to spike, the stock market is going to be at risk and, very frankly, millions of people who have pension funds and who have interest in their pensions are going to be adversely affected, the housing market, which is struggling, is going to be hurt, the economy that is struggling is going to be hurt. So I would hope that my friend and I will go to the White House on Sunday, we will sit with the President of the United States, and we will be for a large deal that is euphemistically referred to as a "comprehensive solution" so that we can in fact—not in the short term, not temporarily, but in the long term—bring fiscal discipline to the operations of our country. Our country needs that. I think the international community expects that of us. And if we don't do that, I tell my friend, I think we will not have fulfilled our oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and serve the general welfare of our country and our people.

Now, some in your party of course have suggested there is no need to raise the debt. Does the gentleman agree with that proposition? I'm not going to go through the quotes, but as you know, one of your candidates for President has indicated there is no need to worry about raising the debt. She serves in this body, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, as he

knows—he and I have had plenty of discussions about this; so I assume we are just on for show here—that he wants me to say yes. I believe it would be a grave consequence if we did not reach the point at which we could arrive at a solution and put a bill forward that would permit an increase in the credit limit of this country, with an associated cut in spending, and move to get our fiscal house in order.

And as the gentleman correctly pointed out, the reason why now we will not be in our districts on the week of the 18th is to ensure that we do get it right and that we recognize that the markets, the investors around the world are smarter than expecting us to just go and check the box to meet the date. At the end of the day, what the markets and investors, and, more importantly, the American people, are looking for is that we act responsibly, that we begin to manage down the debt and deficit. That means trillions of dollars of cuts are necessary. Because I think most Americans are looking at Washington in disbelief, that somehow we think there's not enough money coming into the Federal Government.

I mean, just look at the jobs report today. I cannot fathom how anyone thinks right now is a good time to raise taxes. Who thinks that raising taxes on individuals and small businesses can help create jobs? We are in a crisis. People in this country need to get back to work.

And let me just, Mr. Speaker, for the point of explanation because the gentleman insists on going back decades to recount the past—and as the gentleman knows, I'm the first one to say that we came to this majority with some contrition—that, no, we weren't always acting in the best interests of the fiscal health of this country, that's why we have taken the job at hand and acted responsibly and passed a budget that actually puts a plan in place to manage down the debt and deficit, unlike the other body, unlike this President. And that's why we come to the table right now, as we approach this debt ceiling vote, with a well thought out, deliberative plan to get people back to work while we get the fiscal house in order.

But let's just review some of the statistics, Mr. Speaker. There have been 2.5 million jobs lost since this President took office. There are 13.9 million Americans unemployed right now. A gallon of gas is significantly higher—well into the \$3.50, \$3.60 a gallon in some places in this country, if not higher, up from \$1.85 when this President took office. \$14.3 trillion in current national debt, up from \$10.6 trillion when this President took office. If you work that out, \$46,042 debt per person, up from \$34,371 when this President took office. So you can go through line by line of how things have gotten worse for the American people.

Now, we can sit here and blame and point fingers all day long, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the American

people are tired of the bickering. They want to see some solutions. They want to see us come together. That's exactly why we have altered the schedule so we can begin to actually deliver on the promise.

So I agree with the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip; we've got a serious challenge ahead of us. We on this side of the aisle have been consistent in our efforts to meet that challenge in a responsible way. But I would underscore again that now is not the time to raise taxes. Now is not the time to say that Washington needs more money because that money comes off the hard work and backs of the American people.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, very interesting comments he makes. Of course, he leaves out some things. He talks about the jobs that were lost. Those jobs were lost of course as this administration took office. This administration has gained back 2 million of the 8 million jobs that were lost during the economic program that my friend from Virginia voted for, for the most part. Eight million jobs were lost. And the month that this administration took office in January, 780,000 jobs in one month were lost, the last month of the Bush administration. That's not very distant past.

But let me tell you, I heard the same rhetoric—you said you've changed, I heard the same rhetoric in 1993, same rhetoric when we adopted a program that we said would balance the budget, bring the economy back and create jobs. The same rhetoric, oh, no, you won't do it. The program that you're going to adopt—none of which you voted for, you weren't here, I understand that—but the same rhetoric applied. You thought we were going to tank the economy, kill jobs, explode the deficit and have high unemployment. In fact, as my friend well knows—he didn't read those statistics because he thinks they're ancient history because you opposed that policy. But that policy created 22 million jobs. That's a 30 million job difference between the Bush administration that was the follow-on administration and the Clinton administration. Thirty million job difference, I tell my friend, under the policies that you adopted and you supported in the 2000s.

So I would hope that my friend's comments are correct, that you have decided to change. In point of fact, we need change. And in point of fact, the American public—which is divided itself, but would like us to come together, and I'm hopeful that we'll do that. And my friend and I have had the opportunity to talk about this. We do have significant differences. But none of us can put something on the table and say if you don't agree, I'm going to tank the economy, I'm going to have America default for the first time in its 200-plus years of history if you don't agree and do it my way.

I have said, the leader has said on this side, everything is on the table.

We understand that you have to pay for what you buy, and we also understand we have to buy less, and we are prepared to do both.

□ 1230

In fact, we have agreed to do both in the Biden talks.

Now, my friend talks about economists. The most successful investor in America, I think most people will agree, is Warren Buffett. Warren Buffett said we raised the debt ceiling seven times during the Bush administration. And now in this Congress, under the Republicans, they're using it as a hostage, and you really don't have any business playing Russian roulette to get your way in some matter. We should, he said, be more grown up on that. To that extent, he echoed the comments of our Speaker, who is trying, in my opinion, to get to a place where we can come together, compromise—as is critical in a democracy—pay our bills, and reduce our obligations and reduce spending. Buffett went on to say we should, as I said, be more grown up on that.

If we don't meet the August 2 deadline, he observed, you're playing with fire when you don't need to play with fire. And we don't need to tell the rest of the world that any time people in Congress start throwing a tantrum, that we're not going to pay our bills. That is not responsible behavior. It's not adult behavior. It's not good for anybody in the United States of America, and it's not good for the international community.

In fact, Senator Alan Simpson was referring to TOM COBURN, who has said, look, you've got to have everything on the table, including, yes, revenues; yes, taxes.

Some bard has said that taxes are the price we pay for democracy. They should not be any higher than they need to be, but we ought to pay for what we buy. And if we don't, if people don't want to pay for it, we ought not to buy it.

Unfortunately, the reason we racked up \$6 trillion of deficits during the Reagan and both Bush administrations is because we bought things and didn't pay for them. As you heard me say at the White House, we, both parties—you weren't here—voted for some things and didn't pay for them. We've got to stop that. That's why we put in place statutory PAYGO.

But, very frankly, you say, Well, we've changed. You passed a budget that doesn't balance the budget for the next 27 years. You passed the budget. You voted for that. I didn't vote for that budget. It doesn't balance the budget for 27 years, almost three decades. Very frankly, I don't think that does it.

That's why we went down to the White House yesterday, and almost everybody in the room said we need to do a comprehensive, disciplined, courageous, honest, principled resolution of doing what you say you want to do,

that your party wants to do, and what I'm telling you, my friend, we want to do because there is no option. We must bring this deficit down. We must. The debt we have confronting us is not sustainable.

So I would urge my friend, and I want to congratulate Speaker BOEHNER, who at the White House said, Look, we need to do this and we need to have a comprehensive agreement. That's what democracy demands.

I'm not going to agree with some of the things that are in that bill. You're not going to agree with some of the things that are in that bill, if, in fact, we pass a bill. But if we come together, if we act as adults, if we do what every responsible financial economist and adviser has told us we must do, then America will be pleased with us.

But I tell my friend from Virginia, if we don't do that, if we continue to buy things that we don't pay for and we continue to ask the people to get it for free, then frankly your children, and my grandchildren and children and great-grandchildren, will not be happy with us.

So I urge my friend—he and I will be going to the White House on Sunday. I urge him to come to the table, as I will come to the table. I tell him, with the understanding that compromise is essential, that the crisis that confronts us is real and that America expects us to act in their best interest and have the courage—not the politics, not the ego, not the view of the next election—but the view of the long term, as we come together and try to confront this issue for which all of us are responsible. No one party, no one member. All of us are responsible. But then again, if that is the case, we are all responsible for its resolution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would just try to keep my remarks short, and that is to say, listen, it's about jobs right now. The gentleman correctly points out we have a real spending problem here. And the question is, how do we address the first priority to get Americans back to work and address that spending problem we've got?

Now, if the gentleman says we have to pay for what we buy, I certainly agree with that. We ought to just be buying less as a government because the money doesn't belong to the government, it belongs to the people. And if we want more people to get back to work, we should allow them to keep more of their money so that they can create jobs.

And that's really where the fundamental disagreement has been over the last couple of weeks. It certainly was what put the Biden talks into abeyance because there was a lot of good work that was done by both sides of the aisle in those talks. And I still believe that the product of those talks will prove to be the basis upon which we can arrive at an appropriate resolution of the challenge before us around the debt ceiling.

But why these talks ended was that your side insisted that we raise taxes. And I would say to the gentleman, raising taxes is, as he would put it, paying for what we buy. And I'm saying let's stop buying so much and let the people decide what it is they want to do with their money.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, if I can—

Mr. CANTOR. If I could finish.

Mr. HOYER. I will continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, I know he likes to engage in a lot of the decades of history before. And I don't like to go finger-pointing and engage in that. But every time the gentleman raises the issue about jobs lost here, jobs lost there, what it does is require me to posit again, there have been 1.4 million jobs lost since the stimulus bill.

But that makes my point. We didn't need to do the stimulus bill. We didn't need to do the stimulus bill because now we are stuck with over \$800 billion in additional debt with now unemployment today at 9.2 percent.

So, again, question whether we're on the right policies here and we're spending the dollars we need to be spending. Maybe we shouldn't spend it. Maybe we should let it be invested in the private sector.

I would end by saying, again, the deficit is a real problem. We've got a \$1.6 trillion deficit this year, the largest in history and the third consecutive year of trillion dollars of deficits.

I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, we can't tolerate that. The President shouldn't tolerate that. The American people have no patience any more. That's why we need to get to work, try and lower the hyperbole and get the job done.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

The gentleman, I understand, does not like me to look back. But the problem with being around for some time, you hear people say that this isn't going to work or that's going to work, and you know what? Hopefully that ought to be instructive as to whether it did work or didn't work.

And the problem I have, which, apparently, I know you don't appreciate, is that I've heard the rhetoric before that you've just used today, and I heard it in 1993 when a program which had revenues in it, or, as you like to say, taxes—obviously those are revenues—and it was going to destroy the economy. Who said so? Phil Gramm, an economist on your side. He said we would devastate the economy. He was dead, flat wrong, 180 degrees wrong. We had the best economy in your lifetime.

Furthermore, let me instruct the gentleman, I don't know what you're reading from, but your figures are wrong. Over the last 20 months we have gained 2 million jobs.

□ 1240

Now, did we lose a lot of jobs in the first 6 months? We did. Now, there is no

doubt in my mind for 1 second that if it were a Republican President and it had been a Democratic administration, there is no administration in history that wouldn't have blamed those first 6 months on their predecessor because they couldn't turn the economy around. So, since the stimulus took effect, we have gained 2 million jobs. Have we gained enough? No. We lost 8 million jobs under the Bush administration. So we have only filled 25 percent of the hole. Again, I don't know what paper you are looking at, but you check the figures.

Now, unfortunately this month, he is absolutely correct. It was disappointing, and the month before was disappointing. In fact, of course, some people are doing pretty well in America. The stock market closed at about \$2,700-plus on the Dow yesterday, some \$2 trillion on hand.

One of the things I think that people are worried about is making sure that we act as adults, we act responsibly, we pay our bills, and we ensure that America does not default. All I am going to say, and then I will close, is that I hope the gentleman and I can join together on Sunday and on every day thereafter between now and when we can resolve this issue so that we can pay our bills, stabilize our economy, and give what the gentleman talked a lot about in our colloquies when our positions were reversed—I remember those days—talked a lot about, and that was confidence, that was stability.

The failure for us to act, as we acted seven times in the Bush administration to raise the debt limit, and I don't have the specific number, but more than that in the Reagan administration—and by the way, during the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, does the gentleman remember how many times we raised the debt limit? Zero. Zero. Why? Because for every one of those 4 years we had a surplus, not a deficit. A surplus. And Mr. Greenspan was worried at the end of the Clinton administration that we were going to pay off the debt too quickly. And President Bush projected a \$5.6 trillion surplus.

So I tell my friend that the reason I look back is to not repeat the mistakes of the past. We didn't pay our bills. We paid our bills in the nineties. We started not paying our bills again. You jettisoned the statutory PAYGO. You jettisoned it again, essentially, not the statutory part, but the rule part.

Again, I don't enjoy going back and forth on this, but I am very concerned for my country. The Speaker said he wanted to solve this problem by June 30. It is now July 7. We haven't resolved it. And the country is waiting for us. So let us hope that all of us will not say, can't do this, can't do that, can't do the other.

Let us go down to the White House on Sunday with the President, with the Senate, with the leaders of this House, and say, yes, we can. We can be responsible. We can be adults. We are going to get this done for the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO PERFORM THE DUTIES OF THE CHAIR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period from August 8, 2011, through September 6, 2011, as though under clause 8(a) of rule 1.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 91

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 91.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2354, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2354.

□ 1245

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and

water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water appropriations bill before the House this afternoon.

Before I begin my remarks, let me thank the full chairman, Mr. ROGERS, as well as the ranking member, Mr. DICKS, for their support of a very open process and their support of me as well as the ranking member. I would particularly like to thank my ranking member, Congressman PETE VISCLOSKY, for his dedication to our joint mission and our close working relationship. The bill is stronger for his input and knowledge.

I would also like to thank the committee staff, Rob Blair, the clerk; Joe Levin, Loraine Heckenberg, Angie Giancarlo, and Perry Yates. On the minority side, I would like to thank Taunja Berquam. I would also like to thank my personal staff, Nancy Fox and Kathleen Hazlett, and certainly recognize Mr. VISCLOSKY's personal staff in the form of Joe DeVo.

Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill supports programs critical to our Nation's security, safety, and economic competitiveness. Mr. Chairman, for far too long Federal agencies have been assuming ever-increasing budgets, leading to programs with poor rationale and even less accountability. Those days are behind us now. This bill clearly shows that much greater fiscal discipline and a strong national defense and a strong economy can be achieved together.

The bill for fiscal year 2012 provides \$30.6 billion, \$1 billion below fiscal year 2011, and \$5.9 billion below the President's request, bringing the total spending levels for our bill down to approaching the fiscal year 2006 level. An additional \$1.03 billion is emergency offset funding which is provided to help recovery and repair efforts due to the severe floods we have seen in the Mississippi and Missouri River regions. These floods have resulted in immense devastation and loss of life and livelihoods. I commend the good work of the Army Corps, which is in the front lines, along with municipal, county, State, and other Federal first responders when tragedies like this occur.

Mr. Chairman, there are no congressional earmarks in this legislation. The highest national priorities are protected by supporting the Department of Energy's national defense programs