



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 29, 2011

No. 116

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 29, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY NEUGEBAUER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Thank You, Lord, for giving us another day. At the end of a hard week and after a long night, we ask again Your blessing on the Members of this people's House.

There is very hard work to do as the weekend nears. Give each Member strength and wisdom that they might fulfill the awesome responsibility they have to work a solution to our Nation's challenges.

We earnestly pray as well for the families of these men and women during a distressful time. Give them peace and calm as their loved ones labor here. May they know and experience the presence of Your Spirit and know with confidence that the entire Nation is grateful for their generosity. It is their love and support that strengthens the Members of the House.

Bless all families, O God, that their love for each other will be a witness to Your love for each one of us.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE IS THE BEST FOR THE NATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when the President is correct, we should thank him, such as keeping open the Guantanamo Bay detention facility despite his promise to close it. And in the recent past, as Senator in 2006, the President was correct:

"The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies."

House Republicans, with the positive leadership of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, last week passed the best solution to the debt ceiling: the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. The liberals' cowardly response in the Senate was to table it and hide their Members from an open vote. It is not too late for liberals to vote and join conservatives for a solution which creates jobs and stops the President, who is stuck on his failed policies of tax increases, destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

ON THE BRINK OF DEFAULT, TAKE THE ARGUMENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Here is how we can take a couple steps back from the brink of a default.

First, raise the debt ceiling until December 31, 2012, without its being contingent on cuts to Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or increases in taxes, or cuts in taxes, or cuts in spending. The attempt to resolve all of these issues at once as the moment of reckoning arrives was never a good idea. It guarantees that the people we were sent here to represent will lose either in the details of a rushed grand bargain or through the consequences of default.

Take the debate to the American people in the next election. Ask the American people if they want cuts in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, increases in taxes, what kind of cuts in spending, what kind of jobs, programs.

For those who say, "well, that's what we were sent here to do," claim your victory. You've come here and you've changed the terms of the debate. You lose the debate if America defaults.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5737

You win if you bring this debate into every district in America in the 2012 election.

When you go home, people will thank you for being able to focus America's attention on these fiscal issues, but you may be surprised to learn that the American people did not want us to burn down the house in an argument over the height of the ceiling.

DEBT CONTRIBUTION ACT

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

Mr. STIVERS. It has been said, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a small step."

Today, with a looming national debt of over \$14.2 trillion, we need to take dramatic steps to decrease spending, but we can make a difference by taking small steps as well. Throughout our Nation's economic crisis, I've heard from constituents who have said they want to do more to pay off the national debt.

I voluntarily give back \$700 from every paycheck to help pay down the national debt, and I wanted to make it easier for like-minded citizens to do the same. That's why I've sponsored the Debt Contribution Act, which creates a checkoff box on the tax return for individuals who want to donate money to pay down the national debt. It ensures 100 percent of those proceeds are used to pay down the national debt, and it makes sure that it's still a tax deductible contribution, which it has been since 1964.

So with a national debt of over \$14.2 trillion, we won't be running a surplus anytime soon, but we can allow patriotic Americans who want to volunteer and give money to pay down the national debt to do that, and I hope my colleagues will help me support and pass the Debt Contribution Act.

RECOGNIZING KIDS FIRST, WINNER OF JOHN H. CHAFEE CONSERVATION LEADERSHIP AWARD

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

Mr. CICILLINE. I rise to recognize Kids First of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, an exemplary community organization for environmental and conservation outreach.

Kids First is the recipient of the John H. Chafee Conservation Leadership Award for its Rhode Island Farm Produce to School Lunch Program, which brings healthy and sustainable nutrition and wellness programs to every school district in Rhode Island. Their strong partnerships with nutritionists, dietitians, chefs, and school administrators have brought important nutrition education programs into schools, and have benefited local produce growers since 1999.

Kids First is a win-win for farmers and students, providing local farmers

with a reliable market and schoolchildren with 200,000 pounds of fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables for healthy meals.

I commend and congratulate Kids First for promoting community sustainability through environmental conservation and for growing Rhode Island's local economy.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE IS IN PERIL

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

Mr. McKEON. As Congress continues to debate proposals to raise the debt limit and rein in Federal spending, I wish to remind my colleagues of the perils of Senator REID's proposal, specifically as it relates to national defense. The Reid plan would cut defense, including funds to maintain the reliability of our nuclear weapons and triad of strategic delivery vehicles that represent our deterrent for both ourselves and our allies.

Because the Obama administration has reduced our strategic forces to the lowest level in decades, the health of our deterrent must be a top national security priority. Prior to the ratification of the New START Treaty, the President committed to fund a host of nuclear modernization efforts that were supported on a bipartisan and bicameral basis. The House also passed language in the fiscal year 2012 Defense authorization bill to ensure the President makes good on these commitments.

We cannot allow a proposal like Senator REID's to jeopardize the reliability and security of our strategic deterrent. We must continue to maintain our investment in our security, stability, and peace.

□ 0910

WAKE UP

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we must not forget we're here to represent the people of this great Nation. In a recent poll, 2-1 people said that the reason why we are in this crisis is because of the policies of President Bush. So let's look at those policies because that's the best way to understand why we're in this crisis.

You cannot wage two wars and give tax cuts at the same time. Let's not also forget that President Clinton, by many reports, left a \$5 trillion surplus and President Bush left a \$5 trillion deficit—\$10 trillion.

I ask you, if you believe that these tax cuts are so necessary for the economic growth of this Nation, then what happened for these 10 years? Why aren't we facing a booming economy versus just avoiding another Great Depression?

Mr. Speaker, it seems like you're dreaming while the rest of us are living one of the worst nightmares we can possibly imagine.

Mr. Speaker, wake up. Please, wake up.

PREVENT A DEFAULT

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of this Chamber has a choice to make with 3½ days remaining until we risk default on our debt. And what does that mean to American families? It means higher interest rates on your variable home mortgage. It means higher interest rates on your credit card debt. For our own Federal Government, as well as local and State governments, it means more of our taxpayer money will have to go to interest to service these existing debts.

At this point, the Speaker of this body has a choice. To be sure, he has a negotiation ahead of him. He has compromise ahead of him. He can choose to negotiate and compromise with only those in his own party further to the right than he is within this very body, or to compromise and come to a deal with those who matter and can actually pass something into law that prevents a default.

Namely, I call upon the Speaker to continue negotiations with the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States to resolve this self-caused crisis within 3½ days and avert a fate that will cost middle class families and taxpayers trillions of dollars.

TIME TO COMPROMISE

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 8 months ago we stood on the floor of this House led by the Republican majority, swore the oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and even read the Constitution here on the floor of the House.

We read in the 14th amendment, Section 4: "The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned."

We read that, and here we are on the brink of default because the Republican majority has failed to compromise. The Republican majority said we won't do what we've done for every other President, which is give him a clean debt ceiling vote on this floor so that he can pay the debts and obligations of the United States.

So seniors are waiting on Wednesday next week to know whether they're going to get their Social Security benefits. Military servicemembers are

waiting for their checks. Retirees are waiting for their checks. And we stand here on the brink of default.

I would ask the President of the United States to exercise whatever authority is necessary to pay our seniors their Social Security benefits and to meet the obligations of the United States.

It's time for us to do our job. It's time for this majority to compromise. It's time for us to lead.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 2 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 627, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-187) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) providing for further consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 382

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 382 waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported by the Rules Committee. This would allow for the same-day consideration of any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2011. This rule will ensure that Congress has the necessary tools to pass a bill that ensures we cut spending without defaulting on our national debt.

Madam Speaker, today you will hear my friends the Democrats argue about a closed process, but you will not hear them discuss the unprecedented spending spree that my friends the Democrats on the other side of the aisle went through for the last two Congresses. We will discuss how Republicans continue to come up with thoughtful solutions—and I add, balanced, thoughtful solutions—to our Nation's economic troubles, what we think will, and what has up to now, only failed in the Senate. We will talk about the magnitude of this vote and the importance of reaching an agreement before Tuesday. Madam Speaker, it is time to stop pontificating and start acting like Members of Congress. The Nation calls for a solution, and Republicans are the only ones to offer solutions in legislation, in debate on the floor, and with actual votes.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will go on and on today about how Republicans are closing the process and shutting out Members of Congress, when we're really here providing for the flexibility for the Speaker of the House to simply work with the Senate to ensure a solution to the looming debt crisis deadline is met so that we will not default on our obligations. If my Democrat colleagues were serious about finding solutions to this problem, they would vote in favor of this rule today.

The facts of the case are clear: The chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, has issued more open rules in the last month than Congress has seen over the last two Congresses—or for a total of 4 years combined. Additionally, in the 111th Congress, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI and the chairman of the Rules Committee at the time, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, 26 same-day rules were reported out of the Rules Committee. And in the previous Congress, the 110th Congress, under the same leadership, 17 same-day rules were reported out by the Rules Committee. In comparison, the process regarding these rules in this Congress is a far cry from the previous Democrat leadership's unorthodox and unprecedented closed processes.

I rise today in support of this rule. This rule is essential to allow the

House of Representatives the flexibility it needs to ensure the safety and soundness of our country's economic future. Over the past 4 years we've seen record debt and deficits, which have brought us to the crossroad that we face with the looming August 2 deadline for raising the debt ceiling. Americans continue to speak out loudly and clear. And just as they did last November, they are saying it is time to stop the out-of-control spending, wasteful Washington spending, and excessive government. Republicans have cut spending at every opportunity in this Congress, and we are hoping to do that again today.

Discretionary and mandatory spending at Federal levels are on unsustainable paths. In the last 2 years of Democrat control, Congress has approved and the President has signed into law an 84 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending, and the President's budget proposes to freeze discretionary spending at these inflated levels. America can no longer support or afford this kind of leadership.

The President's proposed FY 2012 budget also doubles, then triples the Federal deficit over the next 10 years. And while increasing taxes on the Nation's job creators by \$1.6 trillion sounds like a good deal to the President, in fact, free enterprise system employers and American workers know otherwise. Additionally, the President's budget makes no substantial effort to address the unsustainable rate of entitlement spending, one of the major aims of the President's own fiscal commission, which he has ignored. Obviously, the President has no intention of cutting spending or reining in Big Government programs. Big Government, more taxes, more regulations are directly in the President's strike zone. And that is the process he intends to challenge Congress to come right along with him on and keep marching toward the cliff.

Madam Speaker, we're at the end of the road. Once again today, Republicans are saying, We are going to have to make tough choices. That's why we came to Congress. And the majority party will continue to do that today. Over the past 7 months, Republican leadership has been steadfast in their support for cutting spending and getting control of our record deficit and debt. The House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that brought back spending levels to 2008 levels, cutting \$100 billion in 1 year. In April, this House passed a budget that would cut \$6.2 trillion in government spending over the next decade compared to the President's budget. Just last week, this body passed Cut, Cap, and Balance, which would limit discretionary spending, cap spending to a lower percentage of GDP, and lead to a Balanced Budget Act, so Congress could no longer write checks that they can't cash without passing the debt on by asking foreign governments and others to make up the difference for us.

Republicans are willing to pay the balance if the President is willing to cut up the credit card. And that is why we are here also today. Republicans have again and again in the House offered commonsense solutions to rein in spending and cut down our debt. My friends on the other side of the aisle continue to reject every single proposal. So, one might ask, What is their solution? What have they have offered this Nation to spur economic growth and to put Americans back to work, we would ask. So, let me tell you. By raising taxes. By raising taxes on individuals, on small businesses, and corporations alike. This is no wonder why we see stagnant job growth, GDP that lags behind, and high employment rates—and that means we cannot meet the needs of this country.

□ 1410

Even when the increase in taxes hurts our economic recovery, slows job growth and places more uncertainty in the marketplace, our friends the Democrats continue to argue for more spending and more taxation.

President Obama has asked Congress for an increase in the debt ceiling, and my Republican colleagues and I refuse to grant that request without a commitment to long-term spending cuts. We reject President Obama's insistence for a blank check to pay the credit card bills that he has run up over the past 2½ years. President Obama's unwillingness to address the true drivers of our debt assured me and my party that we cannot achieve a true solution to the debt crisis we are facing today unless we're able to make tough decisions.

The Budget Control Act we discussed yesterday and what we will discuss today is a step in the right direction. It accomplishes what Republicans and the American people have been asking for since the beginning of this process. It will reduce spending more than we increase the debt limit, it imposes no new taxes on anyone, and it guarantees to Americans that the House and the Senate will vote in the next 6 months on the only permanent solution to our debt crisis.

Yes, Madam Speaker, the Republicans are here on the floor again working on behalf not only of employers and employees but the middle class of this country, those of us who are concerned about where we are headed. There is nothing in this resolution that should cause anyone to worry about losing Social Security or Medicare. That is not even intended in this process. What is is to solve the spending and the debt crisis that we have in this country.

I encourage a "yes" vote on this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I have a point of personal privilege. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

We on the Rules Committee and as Members of Congress rely on the hard work of our staff people, particularly

on Rules Committee, working into the wee hours of the night, last night being an example, until 11:30. After 3 years of tremendous service, my Rules associate, Rosalyn Kumar, has accepted another position in the Senate, and I just want to express my appreciation for her hard work.

She hails from the city of Dallas, Texas, and her hometown Representative is my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS.

I'd like to yield for a moment to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Rosalyn, congratulations. I am going to miss you. It is a good day for you; it's a bad day for us. It is with regular occurrence that I look over at you. You have a bright, smiling face. You have the enthusiasm not only of a bright, young professional staffer on the Rules Committee, but I think you will be a true asset to Senator STABENOW, as you take the experiences from a body that does a lot of work to a body that needs to do more work, and I wish you the very best.

If I could, I would also like to tell the gentleman that Jenny Gorski, who is behind me, a professional staff member of the Rules Committee, will also be leaving. I have found out, after this process. She will be going to Congressman DOC HASTINGS' office to be his adult supervision. So we're taking two Rules Committee professional staff members who will aid and help other Members in their betterment.

I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to be perfectly clear about what we're talking about here today. From the moment Speaker BOEHNER walked away from the negotiating table last Friday to the opening bell of the stock markets this morning, shareholders in U.S. stocks, American retirees, investors, our middle class have lost \$405 billion based on Third Way's analysis of data from the Standard and Poor's 500 Index, and Americans stand to lose more if we fail to resolve this crisis.

Third Way has put together a comparison between the interest rate paid on sovereign debt between AAA and AA nations. This is why credit is important. People understand that. Depending on your credit rating, you pay a different rate on your home mortgage. You might have different financing opportunities on your credit card. If America misses a debt payment, the rating agencies have let us know that it likely will result in a downgrade from AAA status to AA status.

I would also point out that this current bill before us would likely lead to that as well because it only contains a short-term, a 6-month renewal of our debt ceiling. Having watched the dysfunction of Congress over the last few weeks, the global investment commu-

nity, those who loan us money, will say the last thing we need to do is put ourselves through this again in 6 months to ensure stability.

Countries that have AAA ratings have an average 10-year bond rate of 2.98 percent. Countries that have AA have an average bond rating of 3.75 percent. So, three-quarters of a percent difference. What does that mean? It means three-quarters of a percent on your variable rate home mortgage; it means three-quarters of a percent on your automobile; and, yes, it means more government expenditures, bigger government expenditures, just to cover the debt that we already have. In fact, that difference, that 0.75 percent difference over the next 10 years, will cost taxpayers, in additional interest payments, over \$1 trillion.

So here we are with a bill that cuts spending, cuts \$915 billion of spending, but, because it will likely lead to a downgrade, will cost over a trillion. The bill before us today will increase the deficit by over \$100 billion. At a time of record deficits when we all know we need to enforce fiscal discipline, the last thing we need is an irresponsible bill to increase the deficit by \$100 billion, which is what we have before us today.

Now, if we had this bill before us 2 weeks ago or 3 weeks ago, I would still oppose it—increasing the deficit is the last thing we need to do now—but it would have been an interesting discussion. It would have been maneuvering and politics and all this stuff that this body does too much of in posturing, in my opinion. But here we are 3½ days from the debt ceiling expiring, and the gentleman from Texas and the chairman of our Rules Committee and many others have said, We want to. We know we need to do this. We know we need to do this.

If we know we need to do this, why are we doing this 3½ days before the expiration of the debt ceiling? Why are we potentially passing a bill that will increase the Federal deficit? that will almost certainly lead to a downgrade? that the Senate has said they will kill? that the President has said he will veto?

I understand that the plan was to pass this bill last night. I understand that the majority party was short of a few votes. That would have been yet another window of opportunity for this Speaker, who has had many, to negotiate a real solution, to be the statesman, to work with the President and the Senate to come up with a bipartisan package to increase the debt ceiling, cut spending, decrease the deficit.

The President has talked about decreasing the deficit by \$4 trillion. Instead, we have a force of bill that's likely to increase the deficit by \$100 billion—the last thing we need from Congress at this juncture in time. Three-and-a-half days is how long we have to get this right.

I ask you, Madam Speaker, is this the step we need to take towards that

outcome, passing yet another ideological bill that will cost taxpayers \$100 billion and cost middle class families another percentage point on all the debt that they have?

Madam Speaker, there is a route out of this, and the route out of this does not involve the majority party trying to pull back the four or five or six people that they need over there. The path out of this is the Speaker engaging us, engaging all Members of this Chamber, engaging the President of the United States, who has to sign this at the end of the day, engaging the Senate majority leader and the Senate minority leader, to go back to that table that Speaker BOEHNER walked out on last Friday, to negotiate a real solution to the deficit crisis and the spending crisis that has gripped this country, that could very well lead to a downgrade and increased deficit spending unless we get our arms around it.

□ 1420

Look, I think many on my side of the aisle are open to a compromise. President Obama, himself, has called for a compromise, and I know my office and the offices of many other Members of Congress have received hundreds of calls from constituents who echo that desire to reach a solution on this. I fear that the step before us today is yet another example of the dysfunction of this institution under this leadership, but it's not too late.

I call upon the Speaker to move away from this direction and get back to the negotiating table to establish a real solution: to reduce the deficit, retain our Nation's good credit and faith in our system and show that this institution—the institution of the House of Representatives and the institution of Congress—can work and do what's right for our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to a brand new member of the Rules Committee, one of our 87 new Republican freshmen, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia, Congressman WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

It's true. I'm one of the new guys there on the Rules Committee, one of the new guys here in this Congress; and because I haven't been watching this process go on quite this closely before, I'm prepared to answer the questions today of "Why are we here?" and "Why are we here doing this?"

Now, for folks who don't watch the process, who haven't watched it like I have, this rule that we're working on today is to say that you can bring up a bill in the Rules Committee and then bring that bill to the floor on the very same day. That's unusual because regular order in this body says, if you bring something up, let's let it sit overnight so that everybody has a chance to look at it, and we'll bring it up the next day. I'm a big proponent of reg-

ular order. I believe we get the best work product out of this body when we work through regular order, and we've done that time and time and time again in this Congress, and we'll do it time and time again in the future.

But today we're faced with a predicament where August 2 is looming on the horizon.

Now, it's Friday. For folks who don't know, we're not going home tonight after work. Don't worry, Madam Speaker. As you know, this House is going to be in full swing tonight, tomorrow morning, tomorrow night, on Sunday, on Monday to get America through this challenge; but my White House, my President, tells me that August 2 is the day by which we must pass a bill, and here we are at the last hour to make that happen.

Now, why are we at the last hour? That was a question my friend from Colorado asked, and I have the answer: because we didn't actually start this process today. We didn't start it last night in the Rules Committee. We started this process back in February with H.R. 1, a bill to fund the government all the way through October 1 of this year.

It was an open rule. For the first time in the history of this House of Representatives, it was an open rule on a continuing resolution. It took us 5 days, going day and night—24 hours a day at the end—to get that bill discussed fully, because we all had input on that process; we all had things that we wanted to add. This House passed that bill. It went across to our friends in the Senate, and they did nothing.

We had another shot at this in April when we worked through the budget process. That budget process, as you know, Madam Speaker, is supposed to take us through 10 years—10 years. We asked every Member of this House of Representatives to bring their ideas to the floor. The Rules Committee, in its wisdom, made every single budget that any Member of this House offered available as a bill on the floor to consider, and we debated them all. There were some that raised taxes by \$10 trillion. There were others that cut spending by \$10 trillion and all in between. We debated them all, and the House decided on one: the House budget in April of this year. We sent it to the Senate, and they did nothing. In fairness, they did defeat that bill we sent to them. They defeated ours. We only got 40 votes on ours, which was better than when they worked on the President's budget over there—he got zero votes on his. So they're good at defeating things, but they didn't pass anything at all.

That's the partnership we have to have. I say to my friend from Colorado that I'm so proud of our partnership in the Rules Committee and, really, of our partnership beyond the Rules Committee, too, on some of the issues that we work on here. If we could develop the kind of partnership with our friends in the Senate that we've been

able to develop between ourselves here on the House side, it would be a completely different situation here in Washington, D.C.

But even as part of that raucous freshman class that folks read about in the newspaper, I don't have the ability to control what goes on in the United States Senate. All I have the ability to do is to come down here and participate in our process, which in February produced H.R. 1, which could have averted this crisis today; in April produced the House budget, which could have averted this crisis today; and last week produced Cut, Cap, and Balance—which was sent to the Senate and they did nothing—which could have averted this crisis yet again.

In light of all of those failures of action in the Senate, we are forced to come here today. We don't have overnight to lay a bill over. We don't have 72 hours to lay a bill over. We only have 72 hours until my President tells me D-day arrives for our financial markets. So we're here supporting this rule for same-day consideration so that we can do whatever it takes to get the job done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank the gentleman from Texas.

We're going to do whatever it takes to get the job done, but there is a teaching moment in this process, Madam Speaker. Maybe it's obvious to some of the senior Members. Again, I'm one of the new guys—only 7 months on the job here in Congress—but what I've noticed this week is this:

Last night, we tried to bring up a bill. Now, it was a bill that our Speaker and the majority leader of the Senate negotiated over last weekend. We thought bringing that bill to the floor would be that compromise, and I promise you it was a compromise because it was not what I wanted to bring to the floor of this House. We thought that compromise would be the solution to get America out of this situation.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. The majority leader in the Senate has never at any time expressed support for this bill and actually opposes this bill.

I would ask the gentleman to clarify that.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

There is a lot of conversation in this town, but I maintain that this was the topic of discussion and agreement between the Speaker and the majority leader last week. Absolutely, the majority leader has walked away from that agreement since then, and I don't dispute that; but here's the thing:

We had this agreement on the floor of the House last night, and we couldn't find one Democrat vote in favor of it. Fair enough. Folks ought to vote their

consciences; they ought to do what they need to do. We couldn't find one Democrat vote in favor of it, and we've come back with a new bill today that moves us to the right. Now, as someone who comes from one of the most conservative districts in the country, I think that's fantastic. More moving to the right. Let's keep on moving. There's a lot more space over there. Let's move some more over to the right.

But I say to my friends on the left as we try to get through a crisis, a national crisis, that we only needed a few votes from you last night, and then this would have been a bipartisan bill. Instead, we're back down here today.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding.

Here we go again, my friends. Here we go again wasting another day of debate on a proposal that is more of a press release than a plan. News broke this morning that, from the moment Speaker BOEHNER walked away from the table last Friday to the opening bell this morning, shareholders in United States stocks lost over \$400 billion.

My colleagues have been unwilling, not unable, to reach compromise in this Chamber. They have been unwilling, not unable, to tell extremists that while they write their press releases and shake their fists, the rest of us must get down to governing. They have been unwilling, not unable, to let us vote on a balanced plan; and that choice, for it was a choice, cost the American economy almost as much in 5 business days as my Republican colleagues are trying to cut from the budget in 5 years. They're using a manufactured crisis to make the problem worse.

So here we are again. My Republican colleagues have wasted another 24 hours making a bad plan worse, a plan that is based on the same tired policies that got us into this mess: cut taxes for millionaires; give kickbacks to special interests; pay for it all with cuts to the middle class, including Medicare and Social Security.

□ 1430

If they try to tell you that these cuts are not in this bill, ask them to sign a pledge that this legislation will not be used to cut benefits for seniors in the next 12 months. They won't.

After my Republican colleagues pulled their bill from the floor last night, they went back to the negotiating table. But with whom? The Senate? No. The President? Surely not. No, they went back behind closed doors to negotiate with themselves to run further to the right at the behest of the most ideologically entrenched members of their caucus. This may be good politics, but it's not good government.

I'm tired of it, my constituents are tired of it, anyone who's watched the

nightly news for the last 6 months is tired of it.

Washington loves to kick the can down the road. That's how we got here in the first place. This is our moment. We need a plan, not another Republican manifesto, and there are better plans out there.

So, again, I ask my Republican colleagues, let us vote on a plan that has a chance.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, my colleague from Georgia mentioned that there are no Democrats behind this initiative. Again, Democrats were not consulted or talked to to ask for their support or input into this initiative. And you won't find much support for a proposal that would increase the deficit by \$100 billion over 10 years.

The Democrats and our Democratic plan are seeking to decrease the deficit by trillions of dollars over that same period rather than increase it by \$100 billion as the Republican plan does.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed martial law rule.

Today is a sad, sad day. In just a few days, the process in this House has completely devolved. It's shameful. We've gone from open rules to closed rules to same-day martial law rule all because a few extreme Members of the House refuse to do the right thing.

The rule today paves the way for a bill today that is even a worse bill than the one the Republicans were forced to pull from the floor yesterday. That's not coming together, Madam Speaker. It's pushing us further and further apart.

These last few days have not been about trying to find a united solution. These last few days and last few weeks have been about trying to unite the House Republicans. It has been wasted opportunities.

For weeks and weeks and weeks my Republican friends have walked away from a balanced, fair, and bipartisan approach allowing the United States to pay its bills. They've walked away from a balanced, fair, and bipartisan approach to addressing the Nation's long-term fiscal challenges. Democrats have been willing over and over and over again to move forward on such an approach.

To be honest, I'm not thrilled with some of the things that President Obama has put on the table. But I'm willing to consider them in order to get past this crisis. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of this House is unwilling to meet us halfway. They're not even willing to meet us a tenth of the way.

All we're asking for, and I think all the American people are asking for, is a balanced approach. All we're asking for is for everyone to chip in to solve this problem.

I'll say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if you're going to ask seniors to pay more for their Medicare, if you're going to cut vital investments in education, transportation, medical research, and other programs, then the least you can do is ask the various wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share.

How in the world can my friends on the other side of the aisle justify slashing Medicare while they refuse to ask Big Oil and gas companies or corporate jet owners or hedge fund managers to give up their unnecessary and unjustified taxpayer subsidies. But that's their position, Madam Speaker, not asking billionaires to pay a little bit more but asking middle class families to pay a lot more. It's reckless, it's wrong, it's unfair. And I for one will not go along with it.

My friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) says we have to make tough choices. I agree, we have to make tough choices. But why do you always have to be tough on working families or on poor people or on senior citizens? They didn't create this economic crisis.

We're in this mess because of unpaid-for tax cuts, mostly for wealthy people; we're in this mess because of two wars that are not paid for that are on our credit card; we're in this mess because of a prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for.

I would say to my colleagues, enough of the press releases, enough of the theatrics, enough of the political stunts.

I urge you to reject this martial law rule and get back to the negotiating table and avert an economic crisis.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAULO).

Ms. DELAULO. We are now 4 days away from an historic, unprecedented, and needless default that could grind this economy to a halt. And yet, even as they show their disarray to the entire world, this House Republican majority is continuing to hold our Nation hostage to press their radical agenda. Worse, there's only 4 days to go. They're moving in the wrong direction.

The Speaker should have taken yesterday's rebuke by his own party as a clear indication that he needs to go back to the drawing board and pass a debt ceiling increase that both parties can sign on to.

Instead, he and the Republican majority have doubled down on ideology and dangerous brinksmanship requiring that a balanced budget constitutional amendment—a total non-starter—that would threaten Medicare and Social Security be sent to the States before a second debt ceiling increase is approved. This ensures another Republican-created crisis in only a few short months.

This bill slashes \$917 billion from critical public investments: education, infrastructure, research, law enforcement, food safety. And even though the

spending on these programs is less than what it was under the Reagan and the first Bush administration, in fact members of the majority even balked at \$17 billion in Pell Grant funding in the bill because to some of them helping Americans go to college is "the welfare of the 21st century."

We know the deficits have grown because revenues are lower than they've been in the last 60 years thanks to the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and the two wars that have been put on the Nation's credit card.

With 14 million unemployed, we should be focused on creating jobs, putting Americans back to work. It's time for the majority to quit playing political games, start acting responsibly with the stewardship of our economy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Start to work on what the American people need most right now—that's jobs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that the gentlewoman comes down and talks about this game that's going on about jobs.

I am going to read from an article that I will insert into the RECORD regarding information on tax hikes and what that does to American jobs:

"This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the State personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in the State corporate tax rate. Between its passage then and June, Illinois lost 56,223 jobs.

"To combat the job loss caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce 'has already shelled out some \$230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the State.'"

Well, this is exactly what President Obama is suggesting for America, the same thing that they do in his home State in Illinois, raise taxes substantially on all of those rich people and corporations. Madam Speaker, a 56,000 job loss. They're now having to spend an incredible amount of money to convince people, really to pay them off, just to stay.

This is the game that the Democratic Party plays. This is exactly what the gentlewoman was talking about about the serious elements of jobs and the consequences of killing jobs in this country.

Madam Speaker, I will tell you the Republican Party will not fall victim to raising taxes like the Democratic Party and like President Obama want us to do.

We will not raise the debt limit without making tough choices. And, Madam Speaker, we're going to add jobs and do the things that are right that the American people expect us to do. And that's why we're here today.

THE REAL-WORLD IMPACT OF TAX HIKES ON AMERICAN JOBS

(By Rep. Pete Sessions & Rep. John Shimkus)

[From the Daily Caller, July 28, 2011]

Over the last few weeks, President Barack Obama has adamantly supported raising

taxes on corporations and small businesses that employ millions of American workers as a precondition for cutting our bloated federal spending.

To see the real-world effect of this proposal on jobs and the economy, President Obama's home state provides a useful and cautionary example.

This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the state personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in the state corporate tax rate. Between its passage and June, Illinois lost 56,223 jobs, according to statistics released last week.

To combat the job loss caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce 'has already shelled out some \$230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the state.'

So not only is Illinois bleeding productive jobs, but it's now allowing the government to pick winners and losers.

Extracting an ever-increasing toll from job creators is simply the wrong answer for American jobs. Just ask the 56,000 Illinoisans who have lost their jobs since January. Spreading this failure nationwide is simply not an option.

We are in a debt crisis not because we tax too little, but because Democrat-led Washington spends beyond its means. House Republicans have been focused on encouraging and providing certainty (not new burdens) to our nation's job creators—and trying to get our debt and deficit-spending under control.

The rest of America simply cannot afford more of the failed policies of the president's home state, and House Republicans will fight against tax hikes so that we may ensure a brighter future for generations to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I have an article entitled, "Debt Ceiling Impasse Rattles Short-Term Credit Markets," again from The New York Times, discussing how this uncertainty that is not being caused by external factors but is being caused by us, by politicians, by people here in this body, is rattling those who lend our country money. And that's why this plan before us today will increase the deficit by over \$100 billion over 10 years. In addition to those spending cuts, it will cost taxpayers more in interest payments if it jeopardizes our credit rating.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 2011]

DEBT CEILING IMPASSE RATTLES SHORT-TERM CREDIT MARKETS

(By Nelson D. Schwartz and Azam Ahmed)

The reverberations of Washington's impasse over a debt deal are already being felt in the short-term credit markets, a key artery of the economy that daily supplies trillions of dollars of credit.

Over the last week, big banks and companies have withdrawn \$37.5 billion from money market funds that invest in Treasury debt and other ultra-safe securities, the biggest weekly drop this year. Meanwhile, in the vast market for repurchase agreements, in which many financial firms make short-term loans to one another, borrowers are beginning to demand higher yields.

These moves underscore how companies and big financial institutions are beginning to rethink their traditional view that notes issued by the United States Treasury are indistinguishable from cash, even though many experts say they think it is unlikely that the government would miss payments on its obligations.

The \$37.5 billion drop, reported Thursday in a weekly survey by the Investment Company Institute, echoed what other analysts were seeing.

In the first three days of this week, investors pulled \$17 billion from funds that invested only in government securities, a reversal of the daily inflows of \$280 million for much of July, said Peter Crane, the president of Crane Data, which tracks money market mutual funds.

"It's big, no doubt about it," he said. "Seventeen billion isn't a run, but it's definitely indicative that investors are shifting their assets. If this were to continue for another week or two, it would be very disturbing."

Though lawmakers have been clashing all week on proposals to cut the deficit and raise the debt limit ahead of an Aug. 2 deadline set by the Treasury Department, bond markets have largely shrugged off the risk of a default or a downgrade of the Washington's AAA credit rating.

Interest rates on longer-term Treasuries have held steady, but the yield on notes coming due next week, after the deadline, has moved sharply higher in recent days. The yield on Treasury bills coming due Aug. 4 jumped five basis points to 15 basis points, a significant move for a security that carried a yield close to zero earlier this month, said Jim Caron, head of interest rate strategy at Morgan Stanley.

"It's a tell-tale sign of something that could reverberate if it spreads to other markets, and all the uncertainty with the debt ceiling is the functional equivalent of a tightening," Mr. Caron said. "I don't think there is a default risk at all but the market is saying it's not going to take any chances."

While money market fund managers say they are not seeing a sizable wave of redemptions yet, they are setting aside more cash, leaving it at custodial bank accounts in case investors demand their money back. At Fidelity, the Boston-based firm that has \$442 billion in money market assets, managers are avoiding Treasury bills that come due on Aug. 4 and Aug. 11, however unlikely a technical default may be.

"We are positioning our portfolio to respond to a downgrade or a default and we are positioning the fund to respond to redemptions," said Robert Brown, president of money markets at Fidelity. Mr. Brown would not say how much cash was being kept at hand, but said "it's a higher balance than one would expect to see."

In the commercial paper market, where companies raise funds for their short-term borrowing needs, buyers are also seeking shorter-term paper.

In the last week, investors have shown signs of wanting quick access to their money, with financial borrowers raising on Wednesday only \$1 million in notes that come due in 81 days or more, according to the Federal Reserve. That is down from \$479 million on July 22.

At the same time, the amount of commercial paper issued with a duration of just one to four days rose to \$920 million, from \$771 million.

"Investors are scrambling to bolster their liquidity profile," said Chris Conetta, head of global commercial paper trading at Barclays Capital. "They understand that a default or downgrade could be a big, systemic event."

In the repurchase market, known as the repo market, borrowers take loans and in exchange hand over a little more than the equivalent loan amount in securities. Because of their risk-free status, Treasuries are highly favored as collateral, estimated to account for about \$4 trillion in the repo markets.

The fear is that if the United States credit rating drops, the value of those treasuries

could respond in kind. Borrowers would then have to post more collateral to obtain their loans, effectively raising the cost of borrowing. That could ripple into the broader market, raising interest rates on all types of loans, analysts warn.

"The repo market is a pressure point because it can have an impact on overall credit availability, which bleeds through to mortgage rates," said Robert Toomey, managing director at the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association. "Treasuries become a little less attractive if they are more expensive to finance."

The overnight repo rate, which started the week at about three basis points, was about 17 basis points Thursday evening, according to Credit Suisse. That means that to finance \$100 million overnight in the repo market it would now cost about \$472 per day, up from about \$83 on Monday.

"It's a bigger deal than a lot of people recognize," said Howard Simons, a strategist at Bianco Research, a bond market specialist. "If you downgrade the securities you have to put more up for collateral and that affects pretty much everybody out there who has held these in reserve. I don't care if you're a bank, insurance company, exchange or clearinghouse."

To be sure, most observers say the ripples in the repo market will not be anything like those felt in the fall of 2008, when creditors lost faith in the ability of banks to pay back their short-term loans. That caused a problem for companies like General Electric, which struggled to finance its daily operations as a result. Back then, the sharp drop-off in repo lending helped bring the financial system to its knees.

"I think people are looking at the U.S. as the cleanest shirt in the dirty laundry pile," said Jason New, a senior managing director at GSO Capital Partners.

"To me, the downgrade is not dropping a boulder in a still lake. This is dropping a pebble, but nevertheless there are still ripples."

□ 1440

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, yesterday our Republican colleagues said that their party was using the leverage of the default crisis to get what they want, their ideological agenda passed. The problem is it's not what the American people want. Our constituents have made it very clear that when we're trying to solve our deficit crisis, they want a real compromise, shared sacrifice, where millionaires, billionaires, and oil companies are asked to contribute. They also want their Social Security and Medicare benefits protected. Now with the clock ticking on the entire economy, they definitely don't want us wasting time on this hoax of a bill that has no chance of passing in the Senate.

The Republicans took a bad bill and made it worse and less likely to pass, putting in the requirement for sending a constitutional amendment to the States, which requires a two-thirds vote in each body. If that doesn't happen, 6 months from now, what happens? The country defaults again. That may help the Republicans. It may help the Republican leadership save face with

the Tea Party and their party, but it does nothing to help the American people or save us from a pending economic chaos.

This isn't leadership. It's the worst type of failure. It's a failure to stand up for what we know is right, a failure to stand up for the American people, and a failure to protect and preserve the United States of America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans have had to tighten their belts. All around the country, American families have had to decide what is important to them and to divide their needs from their wants. Washington, D.C., has to do that. We have to have not just a balanced approach, we need to have a balanced budget. We need to cut our spending, we need to control our spending, and we need to have accountability so that when Washington politicians make decisions, that the families back home can take a look at it and decide what are the consequences of these decisions.

Now, there have been a lot of consequences that America has suffered because of the failed economic policies of President Obama. One must ask him- or herself, when will President Obama admit that his stimulus program was a failure? When will the President admit that the consequences of his health care mandate has killed jobs? When will President Obama admit that Cash for Clunkers wasn't such a great idea? And, most importantly, when will President Obama admit that it's a failure of leadership not to present a plan to balance the budget to Congress? We need to see the President's plan.

Today, we will be voting on yet another Republican proposal to cut spending and control spending and give accountability to our process, but we have yet to have a bill introduced by the President of the United States. And keep in mind, before he was President, as a Senator, he voted against increasing the debt ceiling, citing a lack of leadership. Today, the bill that we will be considering cuts spending now. It also controls spending because it has an across-the-board trigger that if we spend too much money, there will be a cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, these cuts are real. They are measurable. This is what the American people need to know, something that is accountable. This puts in place a 10-year budget.

The United States Senate, under HARRY REID's leadership, has not had a budget in 3 years. There's no end to their spending without a budget. Amer-

ican families have budgets. Why doesn't the U.S. Senate?

So this bill puts in accountability, 10 years' worth of accountability. It puts in controls in spending, across-the-board triggers. And finally, it has cuts to it.

Again, Madam Speaker, American families have had to tighten their belts. Washington must do the same thing, and that's what we're doing here today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned that the President hasn't introduced a bill. I would just like to point out that the President of the United States cannot introduce a bill in the House or Senate. The President can sign a bill. In fact, in this particular case, he said he would veto this bill because it increases the deficit, it risks increasing it by over \$100 billion.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a study that shows the difference in interest rates between AAA and AA ratings, which demonstrably shows, in fact, that if this bill is passed here today with only a 6-month extension, it would likely cost taxpayers over \$100 billion.

AAA OR AA? IN WHICH CLUB DO WE WANT TO BELONG?

AAA Ratings	10-Year bond yield (%)
Australia	4.92
Austria	3.39
Canada	2.93
Denmark	2.99
Finland	3.13
France	3.25
Germany	2.76
Hong Kong	2.26
Luxembourg	3.29
Netherlands	3.14
Norway	3.24
Singapore	2.10
Sweden	2.75
Switzerland	1.45
United Kingdom	3.04
USA	3.00
AAA Average	2.98
AA Ratings	10-Year bond yield (%)
Abu Dhabi	3.84
Belgium	4.32
Chile	2.92
China	4.12
Israel	5.16
Japan	1.09
Qatar	3.95
Saudi Arabia	3.97
Spain	5.99
Slovenia	4.43
Taiwan	1.50
AA Average	3.75

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

What's going on here, Madam Speaker, is extraordinarily dangerous and it's completely unnecessary. We are using the full faith and credit of the United States, the reputation this country has had since its founding that we are a country who pays our bills, we are using that as political leverage to get our way on budget and tax issues. That's wrong. It's dangerous.

Ronald Reagan, no stranger to fierce tax and budget battles, would never allow the linkage to be made that would jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. We're a bigger and better country than to threaten that we won't pay our bills. This is wrong. We should raise the debt ceiling cleanly because that is what Americans do. We pay our bills.

Second, the bill before us now is, as my friend from Kentucky said, making a bad bill worse. The process that Americans want is a balanced approach. Balance is revenues along with cuts. Democrats have to make concessions on cuts. We're prepared to do that. The President has led. But there have got to be revenues, particularly when we have got a Tax Code that is completely a mess.

What we've seen is that in the Biden discussions, Mr. CANTOR walked out when there were revenues on the table. The Speaker walked out on the President when revenues were still on the table. And now this bill is attempting to impose a constitutional amendment and has no chance of passing; and it, in effect, is a white flag of surrender to a small group in the Republican caucus who won't pass the bill that was brought to us before.

We've got to work together. That means we've got to put everything on the table. We've got to maintain our credit rating by paying our bills, and we have to have a balanced approach to long-term fiscal stability that requires revenues as well as cuts.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to another one of our 87 new freshmen, Mr. WOMACK, the former mayor of Rogers, Arkansas, one of the most beautiful cities in America.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman not only for yielding some time but also for his glowing remarks about a great community and one of the 10 most livable cities in all of America that I had the privilege of presiding over for about 12 years as mayor, a city that continues to enjoy tremendous economic development and influence in the State of Arkansas.

And let me just say this, using that as a context for my remarks, that I think the model that the community that I had the privilege of presiding over for 12 years is the model that Washington needs. It's a model that balances its budget.

When I inherited that city in 1999 as its mayor, it did not have a balanced budget. The government was in the way. The discriminate developer did not want to develop in that community because there were too many regulations, too many reasons why they could go elsewhere and have better margins. Well, we changed all that, and now the city is flourishing in a remarkable sort of way.

And I want to steal something from a colleague of mine from Mississippi that was said yesterday out on the Triangle

in a media event. He said: All across America we're sitting down with legal pads, and we're drawing that line down the middle and we're discussing the amount of income that we have. This is what's happening to families around the country, what kind of income we have and what kind of expenses we have.

□ 1450

Where the expenses exceed the income, we are having to make some very difficult choices as to what to do without. Well, quite frankly, I think that that's exactly what's happening in this Congress right now. We have to take the legal pad out. We have to decide those things that we can do that we need and those things that we can do without based on the amount of income that we have coming in.

The sad thing is in order to be able to create that kind of fiscal discipline, it's going to take something like a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in order to guarantee an enforcement mechanism that this Congress or future Congresses cannot undo. So it's that context that I bring to the table today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOMACK. It is that basis on which I think this Congress should rally behind the plan that we have offered today that is going to cap spending, that is going to cut spending, and is going to require a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution so that future Congresses can't put us in a similar situation that we are in today.

So I would urge a "yes" vote. I support it wholeheartedly, and I would ask the American people to join us by promoting fiscal sanity by approving this piece of legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Well, we are approaching the real prospect of default for the first time in American history, and we have wasted 2 days. While we have wasted 2 days, the American public has lost over \$400 billion of wealth as the stock markets started to slide when Speaker BOEHNER walked away from negotiations with the President. The Republicans have been twisting arms to make a bill that could never pass the Senate even more objectionable by chasing a few extreme Members of their party instead of working with over 180 Democrats on a balanced approach.

I would suggest that people think of three words. First is recklessness. This is the first time in history that we have taken the debt ceiling discussion and held it hostage; 102 times we have increased the debt ceiling since 1917. This is an entirely manufactured crisis.

Second is abuse. This is an abuse of power to try and hold this debt ceiling

discussion hostage, refusing to compromise, trying to avoid a balanced approach that is supported by the American public and what ultimately is going to be required to solve this problem.

The third point is hypocrisy. On this floor, earlier this week, when Republicans actually had the chance to vote for real spending cuts that would be required under their bizarre proposal for spending reductions in the future, when they had a chance to vote for it, in this Congress, offered up by the Republican Study Committee—and I think it was misguided, but at least it was honest—and what did the Republicans do? They voted it down, 104 of them, including their own subcommittee chairman, because it was too extreme.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire about the time remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, many words will be spoken at podiums on the House floor today, some helpful and illuminating, some not. But there are a few facts that need to stand in very stark contrast to all the din.

First, this has never happened in the history of the United States, not from the first Congress until this very moment, that a Congress, a caucus in this body, has tried to hold hostage the American economy in exchange for raising the debt ceiling. Never before, never. We will distinguish ourselves as a body that has failed and has deliberately harmed the American economy because of obstinacy, stubbornness, and recklessness. First time.

Second, in less than 3½ days, our Nation will default. This will, without a doubt, cause a dramatic amount of cost on the American people in almost every aspect of our lives, whether it's in the area of credit cards, mortgages, car notes, or many other areas. Our State and local governments' costs will go up. Investors, pensioners, 401(k) holders will suffer. This is in no way helpful and in dramatic contrast to everything we have ever done before.

There is no doubt about it, Madam Speaker. The Republicans and the Democrats have a very different view of the role of government. Democrats believe that a government in partnership with a free market works well to guarantee a strong economy for the American people, and Republicans see almost no role for government at all and speak derisively and contemptuously about government all the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. ELLISON. The American people, I believe, will agree with the Democrats and history will bear us out as being on the right side.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, day after day the American people receive more bad news, economic bad news, about the shape our country is in. That is what Republicans respond to.

Today, news came out that the first quarter GDP that was provided by the Federal Government, first quarter, was actually wrong, dead wrong. They said the GDP growth was 1.9 percent. Today we find out it was .4.

Madam Speaker, the disastrous results of the Obama-Pelosi years are evident. Republicans want jobs. We need a middle class, and we are willing to fight for it. That's why we are here today with commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the bill that we will vote on later today. And, yes, the Bush economic policies have really now come home to haunt us.

It's shameful that the Republican Party continues their drive to plunge our Nation into default and our economy over the brink. And the bill that Speaker BOEHNER has unveiled today does exactly that. His plan fails to end the threat of default.

And his plan targets, mind you, targets the programs aimed at America's most vulnerable, our seniors, our children, and our low-income families for more draconian cuts. And this plan would sign these cuts into the Constitution; it would sign these cuts into stone into the Constitution.

Trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor is morally wrong and it's economically bankrupt. This rule and this bill begin to erode and dismantle Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; and it creates more unemployment. There will be more job loss as a result of this rule and bill.

Instead of creating jobs, the Republicans are holding our economy hostage once again and threatening to plunge our economy back into recession. Instead of quickly passing a debt ceiling vote and bill, the Republicans are marching lockstep towards default. Instead of supporting the safety net that will protect our most vulnerable, the Republicans are trying to balance our budget on the backs of the poor while maintaining tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and Big Oil. It's totally irresponsible to put forth a bill that would put the economy on the brink of disaster once again in 6 months.

Madam Speaker, there is no time for these Republican Tea Party games. This rule and this bill turn the American Dream into a nightmare for millions. Seniors need to know that they will receive their Social Security checks. Veterans need to know that

they can go to the doctor. Small businesses need to know that they have some financial security and stability to create jobs.

Defeat this Boehner rule and bill. It's really a default Boehner rule and bill.

□ 1500

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. Tax cuts solve all problems, especially for the millionaire and billionaire job creators.

We're in the 10th year of the Bush tax cuts: \$4 trillion. We're in the third year of the Obama tax cuts: \$1 trillion. Now we have to cut programs to continue the tax cuts that don't create jobs.

What's one of the specified targets? Student financial aid. Hey, they don't know anybody at the country club who can't afford to put their kid through medical school, but at the top of their list is cutting student financial aid.

Cutting investments in transportation that could put millions to work. Stopping taxes on the aviation industry, which is, guess what, capturing the money, not lowering prices, and laying off 90,000 people and stopping critical infrastructure jobs for that industry. Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Let's get real. Let's do things for the American people, put people back to work, and solve the deficit problem.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. A very interesting point in our progress here in America. There is a real difference in view, and we're in the process now of choosing which path this Nation will go.

This is not about a deficit. This is about the very nature of America. It's about our heart and soul. Are we going to be a country that uses all of our resources, whether they are the public resources or the private resources, to fill the needs of our people—their education, their health care, their well-being after they retire—or are we going to go a different path and not use all of our potential?

The Republican proposal that's before us—this is not the first—would change America and really drive us back to the 19th century, a time in which the government did not have a social welfare program such as Social Security and Medicare.

Make no doubt about this and have no doubts that the proposal before us is a very significant step towards ending Social Security and Medicare. If that's what the American people want, well, we shall see.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

You know, this is political theater at its worst. This bill has no chance of becoming law. It's extreme. It was put together so that the Speaker could pick up the last two or three votes from the extreme element of the Republican Party. We refuse to be held hostage and the American people refuse to be held hostage.

Let me say to my Republican colleagues: Why don't you try working with us? Why don't you try to work with the Democrats? Why don't we kind of move to the sensible middle and have a bill that can pass? This is what the American people want us to do. They are sick of the political posturing. They are sick of this day in and day out. We are now bringing our country to the brink of financial disaster because of cheap political games. Meet us in the middle.

In order to balance our budget, we need to have a cut in spending, yes, but we also need to have those who can afford to pay more pay a little more, and we need to close corporate tax loopholes, not protect the rich. My Republican friends want to balance the budget on the backs of the middle class, want to tell seniors that Medicare as we know it will be destroyed, want to tell our students that they cannot get Pell Grants. We don't want to do this.

Pass a clean debt ceiling. That's what we need to do. We did it 18 times under Reagan and eight times under Bush. We ought to do it again now and stop the political charade.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the reason why we're here today is because we're spending too much money.

Another reason why we're here today is because the Democratic Party and the Members—many of them who have spoken today—took \$500 billion out of Medicare, and that's why that system is in real trouble. Republicans will save Medicare, not bankrupt it like our friends the Democrats have done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, in response to the claim of the gentleman from Texas in regards to saving Medicare, well, if ending Medicare is one way of saving it, I guess that would be consistent. In fact, the Republican package that was passed in this House phased out Medicare. Nobody under 55 would receive Medicare.

By definition, Medicare is a medical insurance program for seniors. It would be replaced with a voucher that would pay for part of private insurance that seniors need to get, but it would no longer be Medicare. It would no longer exist. So, certainly, getting rid of Medicare, if you consider that a way of saving it, the Republican budget will do that. But if you want to save Medicare, it requires cutting costs and investing in the system and making it work for more American families.

Again, what we have before us today, Madam Speaker, is not a solution; it's further political machinations of the

House. Rather than talking to the President, rather than talking to the Senate, unfortunately, the Speaker of this body has chosen to talk to five or six people, move the bill further away from the middle, further away from what the President will sign, further away from what the Senate will pass with only 3½ days left.

Three-and-a-half days left before what? Three-and-a-half days left before this country jeopardizes our credit rating and our good standing as a Nation that pays interest on our debt. And just as American families, when your credit score gets messed up, you pay more, taxpayers will pay more if this bill passes.

Madam Speaker, it has been estimated that the approximately 1 percent interest rate increase that a downgrade from AAA to AA would provide will cost taxpayers over \$1 trillion over 10 years. And this bill will increase the deficit by \$100 billion.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the conjecture the gentleman has made and extrapolated this out of what this bill would do. In fact, that's not what the bill does at all.

The bill says that we will approach in a reasonable way and with respect to the American taxpayer—and to the marketplaces—a plan, a plan that will put America on sound financial footing, which would be the envy of the world, which is part of what the Republican Party would choose to do.

Madam Speaker, once again, this rule provides the necessary flexibility the Republican leadership needs to ensure that we do not default on our obligations in the next 4 days. Republicans will continue to provide sound, balanced, and real leadership and pass solutions while the President continues on the pathway—along with the Democratic Party, as we've heard here today—of tax increases and job-killing ideas.

With over 14 million Americans unemployed, a \$1.4 trillion projected deficit this year, and over \$14 trillion in debt, our current financial policies are simply not working. I don't know why we would continue doing what we've been doing when it doesn't work, but perhaps that's what our friends, the Democrats, want to do. We, as Republicans, disagree.

So I'm asking the Democratic colleagues, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join their Republican colleagues and me for real fiscal change. Cutting spending and reducing government programs, each of these help us encourage economic growth, not just as we heard in Rogers, Arkansas, but all over this country. It does work, putting Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD an article titled, "Texas Bucks

National Unemployment Trends," because they do things that balance out the marketplace.

I applaud our Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN BOEHNER, for his hard work and commitment to the American people, and those people here in the House of Representatives who will do their duty and provide for real and conservative solutions, market-based answers to get our economy back on track.

Madam Speaker, this Republican House will not raise taxes. We will not raise spending. We will not yield to the old ways of taxing and spending and not listening and then thinking we know better than others.

We're for the free enterprise system.

□ 1510

We're for families back home. We're for job growth and real meaningful opportunities for the future of our children. That is what we stand for.

So we are here today. Yes, we'll stay in town until we get our job done. We're the people who believe in the free enterprise system. We're the people who believe in the people back home. And we're the people who are going to say "no" to Washington, D.C., taxing, spending, big wasteful government. We are the people, the Republican Party. The elephants are in town, and we have a great memory. We know what works. So, Madam Speaker, I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule.

TEXAS BUCKS NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT TREND

(By Tony Gutierrez)

Finding work may not be quite that simple, but it sure seems that way. While the nation's job growth has limped along since the economic recovery began two years ago, the Lone Star State is enlarging payrolls in Texas-size fashion.

From June 2009 to June 2011 the state added 262,000 jobs, or half the USA's 524,000 payroll gains, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Even by a more conservative estimate that omits states with net job losses, Texas' advances make up 30% of the 1 million additions in the 34 states with net growth.

The stunning showing could play a role in the presidential race. Texas Gov. Rick Perry is signaling he may run for the Republican nomination. If he does, he's likely to ground his campaign in his state's outsized job growth.

Texas' big gains are partly a reflection of its population growth. But the recent job gains are outpacing the rate of population growth in Texas, the nation's second-largest state, with 25 million residents—about 8% of the U.S. population.

INTERACTIVE: SORTABLE CHART: STATE-BY-STATE LOOK AT EMPLOYMENT CHANGES

The state's payrolls have risen 2.9% since the end of the recession, third behind North Dakota and Alaska and far outpacing the USA's 0.4% growth, according to the BLS. Also, Texas' 8.2% unemployment rate is well below the nation's 9.2%.

"For one large state to grow (jobs) so much faster than the rest of the nation is very unusual," says Moody's economist Ed Friedman.

Economists point to an array of factors, including high energy prices that set off an

oil-drilling frenzy, rising exports and a conservative banking industry that helped the state sidestep the housing crash.

Yet while energy has been a spark—employment in natural gas, oil and other mining sectors rose by 45,000, or 23%, since the recession ended—growth has been broad-based. During the past two years, professional and business services added 74,000 jobs; education and health care gained 91,000; and leisure and hospitality grew by 29,000, according to BLS.

State officials cite a pro-business climate that Perry helped foster that's drawing scores of businesses from high-cost states—a trend that took on urgency for firms that got lean in the economic downturn.

The 10-year Texas governor is "really focused on creating an environment where people can risk their capital and get a return on investment, and that, in turn, creates jobs for Texans," says Lucy Nashed, spokeswoman for the state's economic development office.

Nashed notes Texas has no state or corporate income tax and keeps regulations at a minimum to allow businesses to grow quickly. She says Perry also has worked to develop a skilled workforce by requiring additional public school classes and pushing through tort reform to limit frivolous lawsuits. The state, meantime, has doled out more than \$600 million in grants and investments since 2003 to recruit out-of-state companies and help Texas firms expand.

DOES PERRY REALLY DESERVE CREDIT?

Yet some question Perry's role in the so-called Texas Miracle.

James Galbraith, a professor of government at the University of Texas-Austin, largely attributes the state's job growth to the energy and export booms. Texas, he notes, has never had an income tax. From 1990 to 2000, before Perry took office, Texas payrolls swelled 36%, compared with 21% for the nation.

"Rick Perry did not come and find a high-tax, high-service state and dismantle it," Galbraith says. "For something to contribute, there (has to be) a change. There's been a change in oil prices."

Others say the state's low tax burdens exact a high cost: fewer state services. Perry, for example, refused to raise taxes to close a \$27 billion budget gap last spring. Instead, the Legislature slashed more than \$4 billion in funding for public schools the next two years, a move that's likely to lead to tens of thousands of teacher layoffs.

"We're not preparing our children to compete in tomorrow's economy," says Scott McCown, head of Texas' Center for Public Policy Priorities.

Texas ranks 44th in the USA in per-student expenditures and 43rd in high school graduation rates, McCown says. Seventeen percent of Texans lived below the poverty level in 2009, compared with 14% for the nation. The state leads in the percentage of the population with no health insurance and was ninth in income inequality in the mid-2000s, the latest data available, according to McCown and the Economic Policy Institute.

McCown says Texas should not serve as a job-growth paradigm for the rest of the nation.

"If you're saying you want to look like Texas, you're saying you want to be poor and have less health care," he says.

The state's relatively low wages, particularly for low-skilled jobs, stems in part from its status as a right-to-work state with little unionization. That dampens consumer spending and limits economic growth, McCown says. In June, average hourly earnings for private-sector employees in Texas were about 5% lower than the U.S. average.

But Mark Dotzour, chief economist at Texas A&M's Real Estate Center, says the state's lower pay helps it compete in a global economy. "Either you choose to have low-wage jobs or you choose to have no jobs at all," he says.

The state's reasonable cost of living, he adds, makes it possible for many residents to live comfortably on lower salaries. The Dallas area ranks 10th in housing affordability among 82 metro areas with more than 1 million residents, while Houston is 15th, according to the Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey. That's partly because Texas has an abundance of cheap land—another draw for firms looking to relocate.

Other reasons for the state's robust job growth:

The energy boom. Oil prices have nearly tripled since early 2009. High prices spark more exploration and production. Meanwhile, technological breakthroughs have let companies extract natural gas embedded in shale deposits. Barnett Shale in Fort Worth is one of the USA's largest gas fields, and drilling began at the Eagle Ford Shale in South Texas in 2008. The number of oil and gas rigs in the state has jumped to 850 from 330 in July 2009, says Ana Orozco, economist for IHS Global Insight. Each rig employs a few dozen workers and leads to hiring by engineering firms, pipeline builders and other services.

Exports. Overseas shipments by Texas' strong computer, electronics, petrochemical and other industries rose 21% last year, compared with 15% for the nation, according to the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank. The state also benefits from its proximity to Latin American countries that are big importers of U.S. goods, Friedman says. The surge creates jobs for Texas manufacturers and ports.

No housing crash. Texas never had a housing boom but also avoided the bust that decimated consumer credit and home construction in much of the rest of the nation. While prices of single-family homes more than doubled from January 2000 to their mid-2000s peak in cities such as Los Angeles, Miami and Las Vegas, they rose less than 27% in the Dallas/Fort Worth market, according to the S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price index.

Meanwhile, Texas banks burned by the savings-and-loan crisis in the 1980s were less eager than those in other states to approve risky mortgages. And Texas law limits mortgage debt, including home-equity loans, to 80% of a home's value.

"People didn't use their houses like ATMs," says Dallas Fed Vice President Mine Yucel.

Texas still was hit by the recession. Annual permits for single-family homes declined 59% from their 2005 peak to 2010, but that's less than the nation's 73% plunge, according to Texas A&M. Similarly, employment fell 4% in the downturn; the USA's overall drop was 6.3%. Texas has recovered 380,000 jobs since its December 2009 low and is now just 54,000 shy of its 10.6 million peak.

Population growth. Texas' population grew by 4.3 million, or 21%, during the past decade, more than twice the national pace. About half the total was because of births, but Texas also gained 849,000 residents via state-to-state migration, second only to Florida.

Texas thus benefits from a virtuous cycle: More people are moving there for work, generating consumer demand that creates still more jobs. That's expanded the workforce, keeping the unemployment rate at 8.2%—ranked just 26th in the nation—despite the strong payroll advances.

One recent arrival is Ife Oyedokun, 26, who this month moved to the Austin area from Philadelphia, where he worked as a high

school counselor, to be closer to his family. Within two weeks he had a job as a rehabilitation specialist for a growing outpatient facility for the mentally ill.

"I was very surprised," he says. "With just how the economy is now, I figured three, four, five months" to find a job.

'HUNTING' FOR POSSIBLE RELOCATIONS

Companies also are feeling the pull.

Corporate giants including Fluor, Toyota and Medtronic recently moved headquarters or operations to Texas, and eBay, AT&T, Samsung and Cirrus Logic have expanded there. Samsung added about 700 jobs in Austin since last year, enlarging a plant that makes chips for smartphones.

Area business leaders, meanwhile, have aggressively courted out-of-state companies.

The Dallas Regional Chamber this month sent a letter to 50 Illinois corporations, urging them to consider a move to Texas. The mailing includes a side-by-side comparison of the two states that notes Illinois recently raised corporate and personal income taxes and highlights Texas' lower housing, labor and other expenses.

"States with heavy-duty business taxes, personal taxes or regulatory mind-sets define themselves as our targets," says Chamber CEO Jim Oberwetter. "That's just where we go hunting."

Texas has particularly tried to lure high-tech California companies to lower-cost technology corridors in Austin, Dallas and San Antonio. Medtronic, the Minneapolis-based medical device giant, has moved customer support for its diabetes unit from the Los Angeles area to San Antonio in the past 22 months, creating 750 jobs in Texas.

Jeff Ruiz, head of Medtronic's Texas operations, says the company was drawn by labor costs that are "significantly lower" than those in Los Angeles and a large, high-quality workforce. Ruiz also points to more affordable real estate and the lack of a state corporate tax, though he says the latter was a minor factor. The company, which also received \$14 million in incentives from the state—a figure Ruiz says was comparable with other offers—chose San Antonio from among more than 900 U.S. cities it evaluated. For some, the benefits are more basic.

Marketing firm Red Ventures this year opened a San Antonio office that's expected to grow to 250 employees from 60 by year's end, says spokeswoman Kylie Craig. Besides the region's ample talent pool, other draws were the city's non-stop flights to Red Ventures' other offices in Miami and Charlotte and its 7.3% unemployment rate.

In cities with high jobless rates, "We're having to sift through (many) unqualified applicants."

Then there's Texas' laid-back lifestyle and lower costs, assets that prompted Vermillion, a start-up developer of blood tests with 29 employees, to move from Fremont, Calif., to Austin about a year ago. "We found it very difficult to recruit people into California because of the cost of living, traffic, congestion," says CEO Gail Page.

The corporate relocations and expansions are having a ripple effect on restaurants, hospitals and other service businesses. Winstead, a Dallas law firm with about 270 lawyers statewide, has added 50 since last year to handle the extra workload from firms, such as Comerica Bank, that have moved to Texas the past few years, says Mike Baggett, Winstead's chairman emeritus.

And after cutting staff in 2009 and 2010, DeMontrond Automotive in Houston has hired about 20 employees the past few months in response to a 20% jump in revenue, says owner George DeMontrond. Houston lost 120,000 jobs in the recession but has gained about 50,000 the last seven months.

"I think people who have held off and not purchased large-ticket items because of uncertainty are a little bit more ready to do it," DeMontrond says.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

adoption of House Resolution 382, if ordered;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 440, by the yeas and nays;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2244, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 671]

YEAS—237

Adams	Emerson	Kingston
Aderholt	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Akin	Fincher	Kline
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Amash	Flake	Lamborn
Austria	Fleischmann	Lance
Bachus	Fleming	Landry
Barletta	Flores	Lankford
Bartlett	Forbes	Latham
Barton (TX)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Bass (NH)	Fox	Latta
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Berg	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Biggert	Gallagher	Long
Bilbray	Gardner	Lucas
Bilirakis	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Lummis
Black	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn	Gibson	E.
Bonner	Gingrey (GA)	Mack
Bono Mack	Gohmert	Manzullo
Boustany	Goodlatte	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Marino
Brooks	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Brown (GA)	Granger	McCauley
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McCotter
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Grimm	McKinley
Calvert	Guinta	McMorris
Camp	Guthrie	Rodgers
Campbell	Hall	Meehan
Canseco	Hanna	Mica
Cantor	Harper	Miller (FL)
Capito	Harris	Miller (MI)
Carter	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hayworth	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Heck	Myrick
Coble	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cole	Herger	Noem
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Nunes
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Olson
Culberson	Hunter	Palazzo
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Paul
Denham	Issa	Paulsen
Dent	Jenkins	Pearce
DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Dold	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Dreier	Jones	Platts
Duffy	Jordan	Poe (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Kelly	Pompeo
Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Posey
Ellmers	King (NY)	Price (GA)

Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)

NAYS—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Ciicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—10

Baca
Bachmann
Coffman (CO)
Giffords

□ 1534

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

YEAS—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Ciicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Baca
Bachmann
Crawford
Giffords

Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—186

Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

NOT VOTING—10

Gingrey (GA)
Hinchey
Hirono
Luján

□ 1540

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.

Stated against:

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, due to my participation in a meeting with some of my constituents, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 672. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this vote.

ESTABLISHING SPECIAL ENVOY FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 20, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

YEAS—402

Ackerman	Clay	Garrett
Adams	Cleaver	Gerlach
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gibbs
Akin	Coble	Gibson
Alexander	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Altmire	Cohen	Gohmert
Andrews	Cole	Gonzalez
Austria	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bachus	Connolly (VA)	Gosar
Baldwin	Conyers	Gowdy
Barletta	Cooper	Granger
Barrow	Costa	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Costello	Green, Al
Barton (TX)	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bass (CA)	Cravaack	Griffin (AR)
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Griffith (VA)
Becerra	Crenshaw	Grimm
Benishek	Critz	Guinta
Berg	Crowley	Guthrie
Berkley	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Berman	Culberson	Hahn
Biggart	Cummings	Hall
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Hanna
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Harper
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hartzler
Blackburn	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Dent	Hayworth
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Heck
Boren	Deutch	Heinrich
Boswell	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Boustany	Dicks	Herger
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Higgins
Braley (IA)	Dold	Himes
Brooks	Donnelly (IN)	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Hochul
Buchanan	Dreier	Holden
Bucshon	Duffy	Holt
Buerkle	Duncan (SC)	Honda
Burton (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hoyer
Butterfield	Edwards	Huelskamp
Calvert	Ellison	Huizenga (MI)
Camp	Ellmers	Hultgren
Campbell	Emerson	Hunter
Canseco	Engel	Hurt
Cantor	Eshoo	Inslee
Capito	Farr	Israel
Capps	Fattah	Issa
Capuano	Finler	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Fincher	Jackson Lee
Carnahan	Fitzpatrick	(TX)
Carney	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Carson (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Carter	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Castor (FL)	Fox	Johnson, E. B.
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Chandler	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Chu	Fudge	Keating
Cicilline	Gallely	Kelly
Clarke (MI)	Garamendi	Kildee
Clarke (NY)	Gardner	Kind

King (NY)	Napolitano
Kingston	Neal
Kinzinger (IL)	Neugebauer
Kissell	Noem
Kline	Nugent
Kucinich	Nunes
Lamborn	Nunnelee
Lance	Olson
Landry	Oliver
Langevin	Owens
Lankford	Palazzo
Larsen (WA)	Pallone
Larson (CT)	Pascarell
Latham	Pastor (AZ)
LaTourette	Paulsen
Latta	Payne
Lee (CA)	Pearce
Levin	Pelosi
Lewis (CA)	Pence
Lewis (GA)	Perlmutter
Lipinski	Peters
LoBiondo	Peterson
Loeb sack	Petri
Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)
Long	Pitts
Lowe y	Platts
Lucas	Polis
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo
Lujan	Price (GA)
Lummis	Price (NC)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Quayle
	Sutton
	Terry
	Thompson (CA)
	Thompson (MS)
	Thompson (PA)
	Thornberry
	Tiberi
	Tierney
	Reyes
	Richardson
	Richmond
	Rigell
	Rivera
	Roby
	Roe (TN)
	Rogers (AL)
	Rogers (KY)
	Rogers (MI)
	Rohrabacher
	Rokita
	Rooney
	Ros-Lehtinen
	Roskam
	Ross (AR)
	Ross (FL)
	Rothman (NJ)
	Roybal-Allard
	Royce
	Runyan
	Ruppersberger
	Rush
	Ryan (OH)
	Ryan (WI)
	Sanchez, Linda T.
	Sanchez, Loretta
	Sarbanes
	Scalise
	Schakowsky
	Schiff

NAYS—20

Amash	Jones
Broun (GA)	King (IA)
Burgess	Labrador
Farenthold	McClintock
Flake	Mulvaney
Flores	Paul
Graves (GA)	Posey

NOT VOTING—10

Baca	Grijalva	Speier
Bachmann	Hinche y	Waters
Black	Hirono	
Giffords	Poe (TX)	

□ 1546

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL STEVEN BLAINE RICCIONE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2244) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the “Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Carter	Eshoo
Adams	Cassidy	Farenthold
Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Farr
Akin	Chabot	Fattah
Alexander	Chaffetz	Finler
Altmire	Chandler	Fincher
Amash	Chu	Fitzpatrick
Andrews	Cicilline	Flake
Austria	Clarke (MI)	Fleischmann
Bachus	Clarke (NY)	Fleming
Baldwin	Clay	Flores
Barletta	Cleaver	Forbes
Barrow	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Bartlett	Coble	Fox
Barton (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Frank (MA)
Bass (CA)	Cohen	Franks (AZ)
Bass (NH)	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Conaway	Fudge
Benishek	Connolly (VA)	Gallely
Berg	Conyers	Garamendi
Berkley	Cooper	Gardner
Berman	Costa	Garrett
Biggart	Costello	Gerlach
Bilbray	Courtney	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Cravaack	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Black	Critz	Gonzalez
Blackburn	Crowley	Goodlatte
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Gosar
Bonner	Culberson	Gowdy
Bono Mack	Cummings	Granger
Boren	Davis (CA)	Graves (GA)
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Griffin (AR)
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Griffith (VA)
Brooks	Denham	Grimm
Broun (GA)	Dent	Guinta
Brown (FL)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Buchanan	Deutch	Gutierrez
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Hahn
Buerkle	Dicks	Hall
Burton (IN)	Dingell	Hanabusa
Butterfield	Doggett	Hanna
Calvert	Dold	Harper
Camp	Donnelly (IN)	Harris
Campbell	Doyle	Hartzler
Canseco	Dreier	Hastings (FL)
Cantor	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Capito	Duncan (SC)	Hayworth
Capps	Duncan (TN)	Heck
Capuano	Edwards	Heinrich
Cardoza	Ellison	Hensarling
Carnahan	Ellmers	Herger
Carney	Emerson	Herrera Beutler
Carson (IN)	Engel	Higgins

Himes	McKeon	Rush
Hinojosa	McKinley	Ryan (OH)
Hochul	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Holden	Rodgers	Sánchez, Linda
Holt	McNerney	T.
Honda	Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta
Hoyer	Meeks	Sarbanes
Huelskamp	Mica	Scalise
Huizenga (MI)	Michaud	Schakowsky
Hultgren	Miller (FL)	Schiff
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Schilling
Hurt	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Inslee	Miller, Gary	Schock
Israel	Miller, George	Schwartz
Issa	Moore	Schweikert
Jackson (IL)	Moran	Scott (SC)
Jackson Lee	Mulvaney	Scott (VA)
(TX)	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Myrick	Scott, David
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Sewell
Jones	Noem	Sherman
Jordan	Nugent	Shimkus
Kaptur	Nunes	Shuler
Keating	Nunnelee	Shuster
Kelly	Olson	Simpson
Kildee	Olver	Sires
Kind	Owens	Slaughter
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Kissell	Paul	Southerland
Kline	Paulsen	Stark
Kucinich	Payne	Stearns
Labrador	Pearce	Stivers
Lamborn	Pelosi	Stutzman
Lance	Pence	Sullivan
Landry	Perlmutter	Sutton
Langevin	Peters	Terry
Lankford	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (PA)
Latham	Pitts	Thornberry
LaTourette	Platts	Tiberi
Latta	Poe (TX)	Tierney
Lee (CA)	Polis	Tipton
Levin	Pompeo	Tonko
Lewis (CA)	Posey	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Price (GA)	Tsongas
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Turner
LoBiondo	Quayle	Upton
Loebback	Quigley	Van Hollen
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Velázquez
Long	Rangel	Visclosky
Lowe	Reed	Walberg
Lucas	Rehberg	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Walsh (IL)
Lujan	Renacci	Walz (MN)
Lummis	Reyes	Wasserman
Lungren, Daniel	Ribble	Schultz
E.	Richardson	Watt
Lynch	Richmond	Waxman
Mack	Rigell	Webster
Maloney	Rivera	Welch
Manzullo	Roby	West
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Markey	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (FL)
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McCaul	Roskam	Woodall
McClintock	Ross (AR)	Woolsey
McCollum	Ross (FL)	Wu
McCotter	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Yoder
McGovern	Royce	Young (AK)
McHenry	Runyan	Young (FL)
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Schrader

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—12

Baca	Giffords	Murphy (CT)
Bachmann	Grijalva	Rokita
Bishop (NY)	Hinchey	Speier
Burgess	Hirono	Waters

□ 1553

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 671, "no;" rollcall No. 672, "no;" rollcall No. 673, "yes;" rollcall No. 674 "yes."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 451

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 451.

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

There was no objection.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 383 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 383

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 375, the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as I began yesterday, when we launched the

debate, it was exactly 3 p.m. It's 4:01 on Friday, July 29. And as we stand, as I do, or sit here, as any many of our colleagues do, we're exactly 4 days away from that August 2 date at which time the Department of Treasury has calculated that the Federal Government will run out of money. At that point, we, as a country, will face impossible choices about what obligations to default on first.

As I said, with this August 2 date rapidly approaching, we know that we are faced with the potential of running out of money. We also know that under that kind of scenario, there are no winners, and there are no losers. We have a profound responsibility to resolve the crisis at hand and avert the economic catastrophe that will come if we do not join together and find a way to raise the debt ceiling.

But this looming crisis is not the fundamental problem. We're facing this crisis because of a much larger, much longer-term problem. The Federal Government spends more than it has. If you think about it, Madam Speaker, we don't have a debt ceiling problem; what we have is a debt problem. The former cannot be resolved without addressing the latter. You can't address the debt ceiling issue unless you address the debt issue that is before us. That's precisely what today's process and the amendment that we are putting to the measure that we debated all day yesterday is all about. And the rule before us is moving us toward addressing the root cause of the problem.

We're adding another layer of accountability, something that Democrats and Republicans alike regularly talk about. Accountability is being added to the plan that Speaker BOEHNER is moving forward. With the amendment that we're going to consider that this rule will make in order, the House will proceed with the critical business at hand. We will pass a bold and credible plan to rein in our debt and responsibly avert the crisis that looms just a few days from now.

It's extremely unfortunate that this process has become so lengthy and partisan. I think everyone feels very saddened at the fact that it's become such a lengthy and very, very partisan process. But Madam Speaker, time is running out. Today we have the opportunity to do our work, and with passage of this measure, we will be moving the process forward to help avert the crisis that we potentially face on August 2.

When we pass this out, we will send a measure to the Senate, and as we all know, this is the only proposal that, when we pass it today, that will have passed either House of Congress. We need to have the support to do that. I hope very much that while many of my colleagues who are on the other side of the aisle may not be supportive of all the provisions in the Boehner plan, I hope very much to move the process forward so that we can ensure that our constituents get their Social Security

checks on August 3, since we all know the President, in his July 12 speech, said that if we don't increase the debt ceiling by August 2, he couldn't guarantee that Social Security checks would go out.

So to keep the process moving, to ensure that we get those checks out and address the other very, very important priorities that we need to have funding for, we can pass this in a bipartisan way so that we can get to the Senate, work out our differences as expeditiously as possible, and come back with what clearly has to be a bipartisan compromise to ensure that we are able to decrease spending, getting to the root cause of the problem, and at the same time, do what we all know has to be done and that is increase the debt ceiling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, the chair of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, today we face a self-inflicted crisis, and the majority's proposed solution is no solution at all. The debt ceiling was created, ironically, to avoid forcing Congress to approve every new issue of debt. The debt ceiling was originally introduced to pay for World War I and was designed to be a formality that would help our country and economy operate smoothly and without interruption. All these years later, it having done that, the debt ceiling now appears to have outlived its usefulness. In fact, I believe we should abolish the debt limit altogether and never face a crisis like this again of whether we will be a responsible country that pays our bills. Only one other country has the debt limit, and that is Denmark. I think we really need to look at this as an anachronism from 1917.

Regardless, throughout the life of the debt ceiling, raising the ceiling has never been questioned. Since 1960, the ceiling has been raised 78 times. Throughout this time, there's been no quid pro quo demanded to raise the debt ceiling, no ransom demanded in exchange for raising our debt ceiling and preventing default. That is, until today. Bringing our Nation to the brink of collapse has been a conscious decision of the majority party. Placing ideology before country, they are demanding controversial and unacceptable cuts or else they are willing to let our Nation default.

We have been warned by the United States Senate and the President of the United States that the proposed legislation will not be passed into law. They have said it repeatedly. They have said it clearly. Yet the majority continues to believe this bill can actually avert the danger of default. They're playing

a dangerous game of chicken, asking the Nation to give into their demands if we want the American economy to live to see another day. I simply cannot agree to the extreme demands being put forth by the majority today.

□ 1610

After pulling yesterday's legislation from the floor, the majority has introduced a piece of legislation that demands the impossible. Today's bill doesn't just require a vote on a constitutional amendment; it demands that a constitutional amendment be approved by both Chambers of Congress this fall. If the amendment doesn't pass, then we not only face the prospect of default again 6 months from now, but we have even fewer options to avoid default.

If previous proposals are any guide, the constitutional amendment would place the burden of debt reduction squarely upon the middle class, threatening Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and Members of Congress would be given a Sophie's choice: Do we vote against this amendment and protect Medicare or do we vote for the amendment to avoid economic default? This is totally unnecessary.

In effect, this legislation releases one hostage and takes another. Six months from now, we would be forced to choose between a constitutional amendment and putting the Nation back on the brink of default. I refuse to trade hostages with the majority and prolong this crisis for another 6 months.

I urge my colleagues to put the country before any ideology and come together to solve an urgent and serious crisis that we are facing today. It's our duty to put the welfare of the country before all else. That is why we were elected by the people who expect us to do just that, and that is what we swear to do. It is time we answered the call.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's bill and urgently, urgently, get back to serving the American people. And we spent far too much time on the useless bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would say to my good friend that I would like to totally associate myself with her remarks at the end in which she said it is absolutely essential for us to work together in a bipartisan way to resolve this issue. But I know this will come as a surprise. When she began her remarks and said that we on our side are working overtime making a conscious decision to bring our Nation to the verge of collapse, that is a slight mischaracterization of exactly where we are.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Spring Hill, a hardworking and not-too-well-rested member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, for allowing me to speak.

I will be perfectly honest with you. There is a lot about this rule that I don't love but, quite frankly, we don't have much time left. We need to get something done and we need to get something done now. This rule provides us with the tools and the mechanisms that we need to get our jobs done and bring our economy and our country back from the brink of default.

Default is not an option. The underlying legislation, the Budget Control Act of 2011, saves us from default. Most of all, I support the Budget Control Act of 2011 because it means both Chambers of Congress must pass a balanced budget amendment before the President can raise the debt ceiling once again.

Do I like everything in the bill? No, I don't.

Does it do what the American people and the American economy need and deserve? Yes, it does. And that's why I support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. The gentleman from California has been talking about moving the process forward. It does not move the process forward to pass a bill that's dead before arrival in the Senate. It doesn't move the process forward to pass a bill that is even more partisan than the one yesterday.

You know, the country has to be wondering, we are 1 day closer to default and, indeed, one step backwards. The Republicans are trying to squeeze out a majority here, and what they are doing is inserting a provision that requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate and the House, and that's completely a nonstarter.

The American public is looking for a solution, not a stalemate, and the House Republicans have become the party of gridlock. Passing this only increases it. It's a move backwards, maybe to protect your flank, but not to protect America.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my good friend that there's a bit of a disconnect from my perspective. So failure to act is not gridlock; passing legislation out of the House of Representatives is, in fact, gridlock.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our national debt stands at a staggering \$14.3 trillion and we currently borrow more than 40 cents on every dollar we spend, and our President and Democrats in the other body say that a balanced budget amendment is "dead on arrival."

Fifteen years ago, the balanced budget amendment passed the House with a bipartisan vote only to lose by one vote, one vote in the Senate. A constitutional amendment is the only way

to ensure that future Congresses live within their means and end the spending binge.

Our colleague, Congressman MCCLINTOCK, might have summed it up best in a Washington Times op-ed earlier this week. He said: Imagine a family that earns \$50,000 a year but is spending more than \$88,000 a year and has a credit card balance of \$330,000 a year.

That's us. We're bankrupt, and Washington is broken.

Why are Senate Democrats and the President so afraid of making a commitment to balance our budget?

Stop the spending. No more empty promises. No more excuses.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. You know, yesterday when the Speaker failed to secure the votes for his misbegotten deal, I thought all these Republicans would need to get under way today was a professional physical therapist to help heal the twisted arms, the sprains, perhaps even a dislocation as all that pressure was applied by the Speaker to get those final votes; you know, a therapist to kind of fit the slings and apply the splints.

But, no, the professional obstructionists among the Republicans have yielded for far less than a deep muscle massage. All they need is a meaningless vote on an amendment that is designed to fail, that they know will never rewrite the United States Constitution the way they would like to rewrite it to enshrine a little Republican dogma into the supreme law of the land.

I will admit that, through the years, the balanced budget amendment has gained more interest on my part. It became much more appealing as I saw years of Republicans entering wars without paying for them, insisting upon the mythology—no, indeed, it's really a political theology of Republicans—that you can cut taxes, raise spending, and everything will work out okay.

Their approach, even though their experts told them these tax cuts would drive us into deficit, they insisted on the political alchemy that they could take tax cuts and turn them into surpluses, just as if they could turn hay into gold. If there were one vote I could take to do something about the George W. Bush administration dripping in red ink, I would certainly want to take it, but a constitutional amendment is not a solution. It's an excuse for not having a solution, for not grappling with the financial problems we have. And the only reason it's being brought up this weekend is just to delay this crisis nearer and nearer to the precipice to which this Republican irresponsibility has taken us.

The credit worthiness and the full faith and the credit of the United States is endangered by the refusal to adopt a balanced approach that would close some tax loopholes and reduce

spending all at once. That's what we need. Instead of putting all the burden on the many, demand a little from the few at the top.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of our very capable and thoughtful new Members of the 112th Congress, the gentleman from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

□ 1620

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak.

As we've been talking so much, I hear so much about a balanced approach. What we really need is a balanced budget.

The concern right now, as I talk to the many phone callers who are calling in, is that America has taken the time to tighten their belts at home; and when you talk to business people, they've made the tough decisions, and they're looking to us now to make the tough decisions as well.

And that's what I think this legislation has done, legislation which we can look at right now and we can put away the arguments from each side, the Republican side and the Democratic side. This is about America right now. The people who are calling in, who are watching, they are watching right now and greatly concerned because of the fact that they feel their economic security is at risk because we can't deal with the long-term implications of this budget and this debt.

There is a plan, and the Republicans in this House have put together a plan. And I'm not going to get into the partisan rhetoric. Let us go around this plan. If we've got differences, let us resolve those differences effectively for the American people. Let us get to work in this House, get it to the Senate, pass it today so we can get the good work done that will allow America to get back to work with a sense of confidence in the future of our economy, get people back to work creating jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to compliment him on his very thoughtful remarks, Madam Speaker, and say that as I listen to this newly elected Member of the House, it is very difficult to imagine that he would consciously engage in an effort to bring our Nation to the verge of collapse, because we want to solve this problem and ensure that we can have a strong and vibrant United States of America, creating jobs and getting our economy growing.

I thank my friend for his thoughtful comments.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a constitutional scholar.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, this rule provides for debate

of legislation that was slapped together behind closed doors, providing for trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts. The final version was sprung on the House after being made public just this morning, and now we're expected to vote the whole thing up or down, without amendment, in spite of the fact that 53 Senators are already on record saying that they will oppose it.

This legislation is in response to a manufactured so-called "crisis." We can avoid default on our obligations the same way we have done it almost once a year over the last half century, just increase the debt ceiling. And now this final version calls for default on our obligations unless we pass a constitutional amendment mislabeled a "balanced budget amendment."

The so-called "balanced budget amendment" reported from the Judiciary Committee does not require a balanced budget. In fact, it will make it more difficult to balance the budget, and it will certainly jeopardize Social Security and Medicare. It will also include a provision that requires a three-fifths vote to increase the debt ceiling, as if this week's drama isn't enough of a spectacle.

Madam Speaker, we should end this manufactured crisis, increase the debt ceiling to avoid default, and then seriously focus on legislation that will create jobs and restore fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, the inevitable consequence of this bill is that when the United States wants to extend the debt ceiling to pay our bills, we will have to reduce Medicare and Social Security. That is the inevitable consequence of these balanced budget amendments. Therefore, inevitably, this bill will not see the light of day in the United States Senate.

What we ought to do is get to our inevitable obligation, which is to come to an agreement that extends our debt ceiling and makes a responsible down payment on our deficit. The President of the United States this morning outlined a way to do that, and that's what we ought to be working on. He talked about commonality between the two Houses and the two parties on cuts in annual programs in the area of 5, 6, 7 percent—painful, but necessary.

He talked about a fair process where a body that would act between the House and the Senate would consider all the options with respect to entitlement programs. Protecting Medicare and Social Security benefits, and looking at a contribution from the wealthiest Americans, the former revenue, would be considered and voted on. And certainly that approach would get us

out of this period of uncertainty by extending the debt ceiling for the country as was done 17 times without condition for President Reagan, seven times without condition for President George W. Bush.

This is an inevitable waste of time, this bill. It's a bad idea. Let's get on to the better idea of approaching this problem and fixing the problem for this country. Vote "no" on this underlying bill and this rule.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to yet another constitutional scholar, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WATT. Madam Speaker, I think this may be the absolute worst resolution I have seen before this House in the 19 years I've been here. It brings to continuing debate a bill that has already been debated yesterday with an amendment, but there is only 1 minute left in the debate.

And the change that is being made requires the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to ever raise the debt limit again. The effect of that is that we have 1 minute—we don't even have it, the majority has the 1 minute that's left in the debate. We have no time left in the debate on our side to debate whether we will pass an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that literally holds a gun to the head of the economy of the United States of America. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves legislating in this way. This is a terrible way to legislate to provide for a constitutional amendment. If we're going to do it, we ought to at least debate it in good faith.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, this is a Republican-contrived bankruptcy.

A decade ago, the majority party inherited surpluses as far as the eye could see, and then they promptly took away the revenue that enabled us to balance our budget. They crippled this country with deep tax cuts. In fact, we have the lowest revenue that we've had at any time since before Medicare and basically at any time since before the Great Depression.

What this is going to do and the reason we oppose this is that if this were on the books, we never would have had the ability to rescue the world from the Great Depression in the 1930s; we never would have had the ability to win the war for democracy in the 1940s; we never would have created a permanent American middle class with the GI Bill that provided the working class with homes and higher education, we never would have won the race to space for the free world in the sixties; we never would have been able to establish

Medicare and civil rights legislation in the mid-sixties.

And certainly, had we been stuck in this fiscal straightjacket, President Clinton never could have raised the needed revenue to balance the budget so we never would have been able to create 20 million new jobs as we did in the 1990s, and reduce poverty, and expand the middle class, and create all those trillions of dollars of projected surpluses that the majority inherited and promptly squandered.

This bill will make us a weaker, poorer and smaller country, and that's why it should be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very privileged to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Glendale, Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Obama and the Democrats have constantly and consistently said we need to take a balanced approach to the debt crisis facing America, but they steadfastly refuse to even consider the one truly balanced approach to this program, that being a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

This effort today will be the second time that the House of Representatives will have passed legislation requiring a balanced budget amendment, which would actually create a permanent solution to this crisis and make sure that economic freedom can be available for Americans today and for future generations.

□ 1630

Yet Mr. REID says he will kill this bill as soon as it comes to the Senate, or at least strip out the balanced budget amendment that's in it.

Madam Speaker, if we can get Mr. REID here and the President himself, and I guess we would have to put out an APB on the President because we can't find him. He is AWOL in this debate. But if we could, I would ask him two questions: First, what is your plan to deal with this issue? Secondly, what on earth is so radical about having a balanced budget amendment to create a permanent solution to this problem?

Now, I doubt we would get an answer, Madam Speaker. So today, we will have to do as we have done before, and we will try to proceed without them and try to do something truly historic that will save this Nation and its people from economic ruin.

Madam Speaker, long ago, right after the Constitution was finished, Thomas Jefferson said: "I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to the Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution; I mean, an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing."

Madam Speaker, Thomas Jefferson was right. And how I wish his contem-

poraries had listened to him about the balanced budget amendment, but they didn't. Now we have a crisis of \$14 trillion facing us as a result of not having this amendment, and it could crush us in a way that no military power has ever done. And in this moment in history in America, we may get a second chance. I hope my colleagues will join us in this historic effort.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking Democrat on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, we have a sad spectacle today of a substantive mess brought to us by a procedural bigger mess. But I can't entirely blame Speaker BOEHNER. We have seen him all week forced to retreat continually from an effort to be conservative but somewhat responsible to a position where today we have a bill that no one thinks will solve the problem because it makes as a prerequisite to raising the debt a constitutional amendment that no one thinks will pass.

I remember Speaker O'Neill when I got here, and there's one thing he and Speaker BOEHNER seem to have in common, and that's a theme song. Speaker O'Neill's theme song was "I'll Be With You in Apple Blossom Time." By now, Speaker BOEHNER is entitled to take as his theme song "It's My Party and I'll Cry If I Want To" because his party has forced him to retreat, first of all, from the position he tried to take to get this thing done; and, secondly, from a set of promises he made procedurally. As a result of where we are today, with martial law rules and amendments being sprung and amendments not being vetted, there is no procedural promise that the Republicans made that they have left unbroken.

So we have a flawed bill, brought to us by a weakened Speaker, under an unfortunate and undemocratic process. Once it's out of the way, once whatever impulses have driven members of his own party so to undercut him are satisfied, maybe then in an adult way we can sit down and work this out.

Now, I expect to vote for something I don't like because we have to compromise, but this bill doesn't even begin to meet any kind of serious test.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I'm shocked. We spent 4 hours on the floor of the House of Representatives in January reading the Constitution, and now we get to spend a minute debating it. It's pretty amazing how much the folks on the other side value the Constitution of the United States.

I'm opposed to the rule, the bill, everything that's connected with it. We approach this August 2 deadline. The markets have closed down yet one

more time before this weekend begins. And President Obama has been crystal clear. He said that any agreement to increase the debt ceiling has to extend it to 2013. And yet here we are considering something that the President has said is a nonstarter, the Senate has said is a nonstarter, the American people have said is a nonstarter, and here we are again debating something that will never go anywhere.

The Republican majority really should be embarrassed for the American people. They are putting everything in jeopardy and leaving nothing up to the President to decide come August 2 when this debt ceiling deadline approaches. And placing at risk our retirement security, placing at risk our ability to get credit, our ability to get a home mortgage, all of that because of this recklessness.

The bill that Speaker BOEHNER brought to the floor yesterday and this constitutional amendment that was hurriedly drafted today just to please the far right elements of the Tea Party, I can't even believe we are here today trying to satisfy the far right when we're not busy satisfying the needs of the American public and the markets around the world. Why are we voting on this plan and not one that has a fighting chance of avoiding default?

I want to say, Madam Speaker, it's time for America to get busy here, understanding that the Republican majority is ready to jeopardize our entire future and put at risk our entire future for this garbage.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the bill proposed last night by the House Republicans set us up to fail and risk a catastrophic default. Today's gimmick is more of the same. But to win over the crowd calling for default, House Republican leadership would now make the disaster even more likely by including a constitutional amendment likely requiring a three-fifths vote to avoid any future default.

As our Republican colleagues sadly demonstrated yesterday, that threshold will be impossible to meet today and in the future. Their blind adherence to the demands of the default caucus stands in sharp contrast to the desire of most Americans who, according to every poll, are demanding a balanced compromise.

This bill is a blatant, cynical exercise in raw political muscle and nothing more. To the House Republicans bent on turning our Founding Fathers into deadbeat dads, I would respond using Speaker BOEHNER's own words from last year: Hell no, you can't.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Madam Speaker, there is a little pattern emerging here. First we had our Republican colleagues walk out of the Biden talks. And then twice they walked out of talks with the President. And then they totally rejected a proposal put forward by the Republican leader in the Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL. And last night they said "no" to the proposal put forward by their own Speaker. And that brings us to where we are today.

In order to accommodate the more extreme elements of the Republican Caucus, they had to change the bill once again. Now what they are proposing is that ultimately we turn budget authority over not to the elected Representatives but to a Federal judge who would ultimately decide how we're going to deal with our budget. You talk about passing the buck, you talk about not taking responsibility, now is the time to come together to come up with a reasonable compromise, not to move the parties far apart.

The last point I want to make with regards to the deficit: We want to make sure that we have a plan, a balanced plan, to reduce the deficit. I'm just waiting for my colleagues on the other side to say that they're willing to get one penny from eliminating taxpayer subsidies to the oil companies or closing corporate loopholes for jets—just one penny—for the purpose of deficit reduction. Then we'll know that they're serious about that.

The President has said let's do \$3 in spending cuts and \$1 in revenue. But apparently asking \$1 in revenue by eliminating a subsidy for the oil companies, that's too far. Oh, yes, we owe China. We need to do something about our debt to China, but asking the oil companies to take less taxpayer dollars, Federal taxpayer subsidy dollars, no, we can't do that.

Let's be serious about balancing the budget and getting the deficit under control, but let's do it in a balanced way. This proposal takes us further in the wrong direction and doesn't bring us together to solve a problem for the American people. Now is the time to get serious.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a very hardworking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I think it is very revealing in the debate today that the American people can see that the opposition to the proposal before the House is that we are attempting to even suggest that there be a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, not any specific amendment.

□ 1640

We want, as a constitutional conservative majority, to see a vote in the

House and the Senate on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, something I've coauthored since 2001. Yet the majority is strenuously objecting to that. The minority objects to our effort to control the debt and the deficit without raising taxes. They object to strong spending caps in the future, which by the way, exempts anyone over the age of 55 and under Medicare, Medicaid. They're exempt under the Paul Ryan budget; they're exempt on the proposal that Speaker BOEHNER has brought to us today.

The Speaker has attempted to find the largest possible cuts with the strongest possible enforceable budget caps that could pass a Democrat Senate in order to get it on the desk of the President before the August 3 deadline. The Speaker and this new constitutional conservative majority are doing everything in our power to avoid a default while honoring the trust that the Nation put in us in this landslide election which just occurred in November. The Nation spoke decisively in electing this new majority to the House. We were sent here to control spending, to control the size of the government, to get the government out of our lives, out of our pocket, and back within the bounds of the Constitution as designed by the Founders. And we've attempted to do that.

I applaud Speaker BOEHNER for working so diligently to find the largest possible cut that could possibly pass a temporarily liberal-controlled Senate in the very short span of time that we've got here. We would all like to get more. But if you can get 60, 70 percent of where you need to go to get the Nation back on track to a balanced budget and avoid the brick wall that lies ahead of us on August 3, we need to do so to avoid a default.

I applaud the Speaker for bringing this package to the floor and urge all the Members to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady very much.

Last night, the Democrats were here waiting while the Republicans could not get their own conference together. If any of you were watching the national news, it was not because we were not ready to vote and to move forward on a compromise. It was because those who believe they had a landslide victory are still talking about elections instead of talking about the American people.

This is the worst bill that any American could ever imagine in the history of this Nation. I tell you that because this bill will in fact default the American Government in 6 months, and it will not adhere to the Constitution, which says the Declaration is the promise and the Constitution is the fulfillment.

We actually have the authority, Mr. President, under the 14th Amendment

to raise the debt ceiling by way of acknowledging that the public debt should always be recognized. But in this particular legislation, in 6 months if we do not cut by \$1.6 trillion and pass a balanced budget amendment, the Nation will default.

And the balanced budget amendment is not by a majority. It is 60 percent of this Congress will stop the American people from receiving their just due. We will not have Social Security. We will not have Medicaid. We will not have Medicare. In actuality, the mandate will cause us to support the Republican Study budget, which is \$9 trillion in cuts, 70 percent of discretionary funding. That means all of your Medicare, all of your Medicaid, all of your Social Security.

Madam Speaker, I ask the American people to call in and say, stop the madness and compromise. Do what is right. Mr. President, if not, raise the debt ceiling under the Constitution. You have the authority.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the "Budget Control Act of 2011," which, like the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, attempts to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by demanding sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-changing sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share.

In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support a bill that unduly robs average Americans of their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 cuts \$22 billion from the Federal Budget for FY2012. Robert McIntyre, of Citizens for Tax Justice testified before the Senate Budget Committee that tax loopholes for corporations, big business owners and business investors cost the Treasury Department \$365 billion in FY2011.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated in a recently before the House Committee on Financial Services. "We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut," Chairman Bernanke further stated "You need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position."

The Boehner plan does just that it will cut, cut, cut without taking into full consideration the serious cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This bill is essentially a rehashed version of the same bill that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks for \$917 billion in cuts from domestic spending for a \$900 billion increase in the debt ceiling, while demanding

nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. This is nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public will be hit again for \$1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits. Anyone who believes that this plan will not result in a serious cut to Social Security should consider this . . . Social Security represents 20 percent of all federal spending, making it unrealistic to think such large cuts in mandatory spending will not affect Social Security benefits.

I state here today that the Boehner proposal is ill-conceived and fails to offer a balanced approach to decreasing the deficit. Instead of requiring shared sacrifice, the Boehner plan places the entire burden on the backs of seniors, the middle class and our nation's most vulnerable citizens, while doing nothing to close corporate tax giveaways and increase taxes on those most able to afford them.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years through strict new spending caps. Most experts predict that the first round of cuts would target discretionary programs, including education, infrastructure, job training and law enforcement. The Boehner plan would then require an additional \$1.8 trillion in savings to be identified by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time. Given the magnitude of these additional required savings, it would result in deep draconian cuts in federal entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. A repeal of health reform's coverage expansions. And a dramatic reduction in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. This is unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder a fair share of this burden.

The Speaker's plan requires a vote on an ill-advised constitutional balanced budget amendment in both chambers of Congress by the end of this year. The details surrounding exactly which proposed constitutional balanced budget amendment will be voted on are unclear. However, earlier proposals that have appeared in the House of Representatives, including H.J. Res. 1, would have a devastating impact on discretionary spending and on our modest economic recovery.

Passing an amendment to the Constitution is one of the most serious processes the United States Congress can undertake, requiring a two thirds supermajority of support in both the House and Senate and ratification by three fourths (¾) of the States. The Founders purposely made the amendment process a long and arduous one. Do my Republican colleagues really expect Congress to capriciously pass an amendment altering our nation's founding document on such short notice; an amendment that will fundamentally change our country without reasonable time for debate; without the opportunity for a hearing or questioning of witnesses; without any reports as to what impact it may have?

By tying the fate of whether the United States pays its debt obligations to the historically prolonged Constitutional amendment process, the Republicans who support this bill have demonstrated, at this critical juncture in American history, that they are profoundly irresponsible when it comes to the integrity of our

economy and utterly bereft of sensible solutions for fixing it.

The Speaker's plan will result in for \$2.7 trillion in deficit reduction and a \$2.5 trillion increase in the debt limit in two stages, with the two debt ceiling increases being conditioned upon enactment of an initial set of spending, cuts and a later, second deficit reduction measure.

I do not believe that Congress should yield its authority to what amounts to a Commission. BOEHNER's plan creates a 12-member joint congressional committee to develop a plan for an additional \$1.8 trillion in deficit reduction that Congress would vote on in December. In addition the Speaker's plan authorizes the president to submit a \$900 billion increase in the \$14.3 trillion debt ceiling immediately after enactment of this bill, and a \$1.6 trillion increase if the \$1.8 trillion deficit reduction measure is enacted. Both debt limit increases would take effect automatically unless Congress enacted resolutions of disapproval. The Speaker's plan also requires the House and Senate to vote by the end of the year on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. As I have stated before this will tie the hands of Congress.

Finally, as noted above, the Boehner proposal provides only a short-term extension of the federal debt ceiling. This means that the gridlock that now prevails in our government will continue for the remainder of the 112th Congress. According to the Center on Budget and Policy, recent reports have suggested that rating agencies will downgrade the U.S. credit rating if the Boehner proposal is enacted. This would result not only in higher interest costs to the federal government but also would raise the interest rate paid by individuals and families on car loans, credit cards and mortgages throughout the United States. Taken together, all of these factors would undermine the nation's fragile recovery.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs that benefit the public good and for the most at need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences!

In my district, the Texas 18th, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program (SNAP) that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011 or the Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the U.S. Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than \$22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States' poor population.

In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

There is no doubt that we must reduce the national debt, but my Republican colleague's desire for instant gratification through deep spending cuts to benefits, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security is reckless and threatens the financial security of millions of Americans.

Instead of closing corporate tax loopholes to reduce the deficit, the Budget Control Act cuts discretionary spending, and requires Congress to draft proposals to cut at least \$1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security. This is an outrage, and an insult to the American dream.

Forcing Congress to draft plans to cut 1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security forces Members to disregard the best interests of their constituents. Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Any cuts to Medicaid would be just as damaging. Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,000 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare should Congress sacrifice Medicaid to cut spending.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing our debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology. The game is up, and the American people understand that increasing the debt ceiling has nothing to do with any new spending and everything to do with paying off the obligations that we have already agreed to and promised to pay.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was

needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at \$14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2nd.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. America has earned a reputation as the world's most trusted borrower. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For investors around the world, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the federal government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which in the irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraor-

dinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3rd, the stock market will react violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay.

Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The proponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will reduce America's ability to compete with a surging China.

Furthermore, any investors that do continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. We must not allow another wild fluctuation to occur due to default and add to the uncertainty still lingering in the minds of citizens.

The Speaker's plan is a short term fix for a long term issue. It is a patch rather than a proper repair. BOEHNER's plan requires that Congress address debt ceiling once again in a short span of time, which will once again lead to market uncertainty in a time when we are trying to rebuild our nation. This plan is not good for Wall Street and it is not good for the American people. The Speaker's bill is a short-term debt limit increase that will only ensure that Congress will go through this exact same standoff again in the next few months. Short-term proposals risk further uncertainty and the potentially damaging downgrade of the U.S. credit rating. The markets have made it clear that a short-term extension is not sufficient and could result in very serious consequences. While Democrats support deficit

reduction, we support doing it in a balanced way that provides certainty to the economy.

As if another stock market crisis were not enough, the housing market would take another hit if America defaulted. Higher mortgage rates in a housing market already weakened by default and foreclosures would cause a further depression of home values, destroying whatever equity families might have left in their homes after the housing crisis. Moreover, the long-term effects would reduce spending and investment in the housing market.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

Even prominent Republicans like Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Christine Todd Whitman have criticized the radical elements of their party who insist upon holding up the entire political process in order to flaunt their extreme, irrational, and unrealistic ideology. Senator MCCAIN has called the Tea Party's stance and the way they have conducted themselves during this manufactured crisis "bizarre," and I am inclined to agree. Their agenda for this country is even too radical for Speaker BOEHNER, with the Tea Party vowing to reject their leader's own bill.

They live in a world that is not the world that the American people live in. In their world, they believe that taxes are always too high, even on people making over a billion a year in a struggling economy; that any increase in revenue is fundamentally wrong, even if it comes from large corporations who use tax loopholes at the expense of our job-creating small businesses; that investing anything in our economic future above tax revenues is impermissible, even in the midst of an economic downturn; and that tax cuts for the wealthy are always the nation's top priority, even at the expense of people that depend on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits to survive.

These beliefs place them on the fringe of American society, and yet due to the nature of our political process, they have held up the entire government and placed our economy on the precipice of a turbulent second recession.

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section four, which states "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." The argument can be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President, to protect the interest of our nation, must act. The President would then have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, on his own, through executive order if Congress fails to raise the debt limit by the August 2, 2011 deadline. As a body we should not place the President or our country in this position.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be hurt by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live; a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben

Bernanke warned that defaulting could "throw the financial system into chaos," and "destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world."

Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts and Constitutional amendments into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to one of our thoughtful, hard-working new Members of this Congress, the gentleman from Manchester, New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

What I want to say to the American people is: Let's stop the spending. Let's not call the President or the Congress to say stop this madness. Call this body and say: Stop the spending. Because we have a \$14.3 trillion debt. We have a \$1.6 trillion deficit. Most Americans know and appreciate that that is not sustainable.

We today, through the will of the House and the work over the course of this week and past several weeks, have a piece of legislation that is responsible in that it cuts spending, caps future spending, requires a balanced budget amendment, so the country can finally have a voice—have a voice in how people in this body spend taxpayer dollars.

It's time for us to tell the American people the truth about how their money is being wasted. It is time to stop that spending. It is time to get responsible and serious. And we are here to do that. Not just my freshman class, but this Congress is here to do that. And I ask my friends from the other side to join us in that fight to protect taxpayers and vote for this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for her generosity.

I advise my colleagues, budgets will balance when people go back to work. I rise against this amendment, the rule, and the underlying bill as "inartful" dodges from necessity. When a patient is weak, do you pull out their intravenous feeding tubes, or do you help them recover? Do you do everything possible to build their strength, or do you keep shutting off their oxygen machine?

America's economy is struggling to grow after the deep Bush recession triggered by his bailout of Wall Street abuse, two wars, and trillions in tax cuts to the super-rich who, by the way, didn't create any jobs with it. Revenues to our Federal Government have fallen over \$400 billion a year due to unemployment. That's \$4 trillion over

a decade. So what does the majority do to the patient? They pull out the tubes, and they now shove them down the elevator chute.

Never before has any political party chosen to hurt America when she was recovering by edging her toward default. Their dangerous behavior has already caused hundreds of billions of dollars of losses in the stock market, pension funds and annuities. Social Security and Medicare checks are threatened, and economic growth and jobs are stalled due to all this uncertainty in the markets.

Madam Speaker, America needs a Congress and President that focus on economic recovery and job creation. Budgets will balance when people go back to work. To delude oneself the cause is otherwise is to take America down the proverbial black hole. Jobs are the answer—not more dodges, not pushing the patient down the shaft, and not proposing amendments that truly dodge the real question, which is full economic recovery for the people of this country.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my good friend from Rochester how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I believe I have two.

Mr. DREIER. In light of that, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentle lady for her leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Republican rule.

We have all been getting numerous phone calls from our constituents who are rightly worried that the interest rates will be going up on their homes, on their cars, on their student loans, because they see that this Congress is in chaos. Already since last Friday, shareholders in U.S. markets have lost over \$400 billion in value just due to the uncertainty and the lack of action. Our constituents' retirement funds have been taking a hit—and will continue to until this issue is decided. We have less than 4 days.

We must stop this "Republican roulette" and get to work on a plan that is realistic, that can pass both Houses. This is a dangerous game, putting forward a partisan bill that, each time it comes back, is more partisan, appealing to a narrower sliver of America.

Madam Speaker, we need to revisit a clean vote on the debt ceiling—as we have done 78 times since 1960. If we don't, the President should do his constitutional duty and raise the debt ceiling on his own under the authority of the 14th Amendment. The Republican leadership has walked out on President Obama, on Vice President BIDEN, on MCCONNELL, and even their own leader, BOEHNER. Then they want us to revisit

this in 6 months and put the economy in uncertainty. This is the wrong direction.

I urge a “no” vote.

□ 1650

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I oppose the Republican default bill because it will lead to drastic cuts to Medicare and Social Security. Also, I oppose the Republican default bill because it protects tax breaks and loopholes for those Americans who make millions and billions of dollars in income per year. I oppose the Republican default bill because it calls for another default summit, another default crisis, in 6 months, thereby undermining the certainty that American businesses, investors, and families need to create jobs and move our country forward.

With only a short-term increase under the Republican default bill, the full faith and credit of the United States will once again be held hostage to the differences in Washington. The Republicans’ short-term plan that creates uncertainty will result in billions of dollars in increased interest rates that will hurt every single American and will hurt our country.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join with the Democrats, to join with President Obama in creating a balanced plan with shared sacrifice that solves our debt crisis and eliminates this cloud hanging over our economy.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the former mayor of one of the 10 most livable cities in the United States of America, the gentleman from Rogers, Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding some time.

On my way over to the Capitol this afternoon, I was accompanied by some young people from back in my district, Payson and McKenna from Mena, Arkansas, and Adam and Grace Anne from Fayetteville, Arkansas; and we were having a conversation about the debate that’s going on right now in Washington, the debate about the debt ceiling. I explained to these young people that the current debt of the United States of America, their share of that current debt, is well into the mid-\$40,000 range, \$46,000-or-so of debt.

It is for this very reason that we are proposing what we are proposing, because the only way to keep this debt on these innocent young people from soaring to greater and greater levels, to an area that they can no longer afford, is to restrain, constrain government; and the only sure way to do that, the only guaranteed enforcement mechanism that I know that can accomplish that very thing is a balanced budget amendment.

So on behalf of these young people and on behalf of young people across

America, let’s quit piling more and more debt on our children and grandchildren. Let’s pass the rule. Let’s pass this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. In my 1 minute, I want to make a special appeal that we pay close attention to what I consider the most devastating, damaging part of this bill, and that is what we are doing and what the Republicans are doing to Social Security, to Medicare, and to Medicaid.

In this bill, it requires that we set up a joint select committee. There are no protections in here. And it says in order for us to give the raise to the debt ceiling, we must concur and cut \$1.6 trillion from the budget from discretionary funding. The Center for Policy and Budget Priorities has said that since 80 percent of the discretionary areas come from Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare, it doesn’t take a genius to know that we’re talking about drastic cuts in this area, and they will come out to a tune of about a thousand dollars for each recipient.

Now, I don’t know about you all, but we have some people in this country who are hanging on by their fingernails. We have widows, we have seniors, we have youngsters who are depending upon Social Security, depending upon Medicare; and to say that in this measure that we will make these drastic cuts in Social Security and Medicare is totally irresponsible, and for that reason let us vote this measure down.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, this rule and the bill will further drive a wedge between the two parties rather than bringing us closer to an agreement, which we must have. It’s been a week since the bipartisan discussions over the \$4 trillion “grand deal” broke down, and we’ve seen little progress toward a solution since then.

Missing in today’s debate is a bipartisan approach toward our Nation’s fiscal health. We must have a bipartisan approach. We can cut through the partisan rhetoric with a balanced package. For me, that means implementing the Simpson-Bowles recommendations to reduce spending by \$4 trillion over the next 10 years, lowering tax rates, ensuring solvency of Medicare and Social Security, and stabilizing our debt.

The House should also consider a clean balanced budget amendment, H.J. Res. 2, which says the country can’t spend more than it takes in. This amendment and the Simpson-Bowles recommendations must be coupled with a debt limit increase to get us through the next 18 months.

It’s time for cooler heads to prevail. With the clock ticking down, our Nation’s first-ever default is at hand. We

cannot afford to wait a minute longer. Default is not an option.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, ranking Democrat on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady.

The Republican Party deficit plan is very simple:

Number one, send the financial markets into a nose dive.

Number two, drive up costs for home mortgages, student loans, and credit cards.

Number three, spook businesses to stall job growth, bringing the Nation to the brink of economic collapse.

Number four, repeat it all again and again until election day 2012.

The Republicans don’t want compromise; they want capitulation. The Republicans have brought to the floor a constitutional amendment to balance the budget that’s going nowhere. It is phony. But there’s another sinister constitutional amendment being debated here, it’s very real; and it will cause our country to default on its obligations.

Amendment 14, section 4, of the Constitution says: “The validity of the public debt shall not be questioned.” But this bill would change the Constitution forever—forever.

Under this Republican bill, our country would be pushed into defaulting on our obligations. The Republican Party would turn the 14th Amendment from a guarantee into a question mark. Now, under the Republican bill: “The validity of the public debt shall be questioned.” That is what they are doing this weekend.

This is unacceptable and would have a disastrous effect upon our economy and the middle class. The only way to end this historic nightmare is to resolve another massive deficit, the leadership deficit in the Republican Party. We must vote down this constitutional amendment, which will have us not honoring the full faith and credit of the United States which was built into the 14th Amendment of our United States Constitution. They are amending that Constitution here this evening. They are leading us to a default which will be a violation of that Constitution.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democrat leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and commend her and her colleagues on the Rules Committee for their important work in bringing legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking. The clock is ticking on the need for us to raise the debt ceiling so that we do not default on our past obligations, that we uphold the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

□ 1700

As we continue this debate today, one thing is very clear to me. If our goal were to find deficit reduction in a balanced, bipartisan way, we could certainly do that. We've had models by Simpson-Bowles. We've had the Gang of Six. We've had the President's conversations with Speaker BOEHNER. We could find a path to very serious deficit reduction, but I think it has become very clear that that is not the goal of the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

They keep moving the goalpost, making it very evident that their goal is to reduce the public role in the lives of the American people. That's why, in other legislation on the floor, like the Interior bill that has been debated, you see the abandoning of clean air standards, clean water, food safety. I've said before I come to this Congress as a mother and a grandmother. We all want to do the best for our children personally, but we need a public role in their education and, again, in clean air, clean water, food safety. We can't do that for ourselves, but part of the Republican plan is to unravel 50 years—five decades at least—of bipartisan progress on behalf of America's middle class families.

Flatout, this bill and the other bills accompanying it will end Medicare, will end Medicaid, will say to seniors, You will pay more for your health care costs to get less so that we can give tax subsidies to Big Oil. We will say to those families, We're going to cut Medicaid. What that means to seniors in nursing homes is that we will give tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas. We will say to the young people, You're going to pay more for your college loans so that we can give tax cuts to the people at the highest end.

We all know that we have to participate in reducing the deficit. Everybody has to ante up. Why is it that the Republicans insist on having the middle class pay the price so that the high end is off the hook?

If we are concerned about addressing the problems of the American people, we would end this debate. This bill is going nowhere. It is a total waste of time. Every day that we spend on these wastes of time that are not going anywhere is another day we are not talking about the highest priority of the American people, which is job creation, job creation, job creation. That is their priority. We have an obligation to reduce the deficit and get on with it so we can create jobs.

If we are concerned about the economic security of the American people and their families, we must recognize that, since the Republicans' most recent walking away from the table—they've done it on more than one occasion, but last Friday the Speaker and the Republicans walked away from the table—the stock market has dropped 483 points, and the American people have lost over \$400 billion in their personal assets, \$400 billion. Every day

that goes by and if the market goes down any more, it comes right out of what the American people have in their 401(k)s, in their pensions and other pensions, and in their savings for their children's educations.

I remember when we had the debate on TARP. We cooperated with President Bush at that time to bring legislation to the floor. It was very unpopular. It was probably the most unpopular vote any of us will have to take, but we were on the brink of a financial crisis, and we had to act; but the Republicans did not step up to the plate, and the market went down 777 points the next day.

Is that what they're waiting for, for the market to go down not 485 points in the last few days but hundreds of points more, diminishing the personal assets and wealth of the American people? I certainly hope not.

When the Speaker walked away and he made his statement, Speaker BOEHNER, our Speaker, said that we couldn't reach agreement, words to that effect, that we couldn't connect because we have different visions of America. I believe the Speaker when he speaks, but I don't believe we have different visions of America.

President Obama's vision of America is one where we are committed to the education of our children so they can reach their personal fulfillment and so our country through innovation can continue to be number one—committed to creating jobs, good-paying jobs, for America's workers. I think that vision is the vision of the American people, the high ground of where we share values: in the education of our children, jobs for our workers, in the dignified retirement and health security for our seniors, and in the personal safety and national security of our people—all done in a fiscally sound way.

I think that that's common ground on the high ground of values. If you believe that, if you agree with those values, as I think Speaker BOEHNER must agree with President Obama on that vision of America, you couldn't possibly vote for any of the legislation that the Republicans are bringing to the floor in these few days—you couldn't possibly—because they do undermine the education of our children, the financial and health security of our seniors. The deep cuts early on hurt the economic recovery and the creation of jobs. This isn't done in a fiscally sound way as we've taken revenue off the table. Fifty-seven percent of the American people at least think we should have a balanced, bipartisan agreement to end this default and to do so in a way that doesn't take us down this path again.

So let's be clear. What is on the floor today is a balanced budget. Balanced in what way? Balanced in whose favor? It looks like a seesaw to me in favor of the "haves" at the expense of a great middle class in our country. It must be rejected.

For every day that we waste on another Republican ideological ploy or

scheme is another day that we are not creating jobs. Since the Republicans took office, which is over 200 days ago—last Saturday it was 200 days, going on 207—the only bills that they have brought to the floor which they claim to be jobs bills are not job creators; they are job losers. H.R. 1 loses about 700,000 jobs—H.R. 2, a similar number; H.R. 34, a similar number with nearly 2 million jobs lost. Almost 10,000 jobs a day they're losing. Their infrastructure bill that they have brought in to committee—they haven't voted on it yet, thank God—is estimated to lose another 700,000 jobs when it's supposed to be the big job creator. Even the Chamber of Commerce has rejected it as something that will not only not create jobs but will lose current jobs.

So let's get on with the business of job creation. Let's really be honest about what we're here to do in terms of deficit reduction and not use it as an engine for the destruction of the public role that is so important in the defense of our country, in the health of our children, in the security of our seniors and their retirements, and in the vitality and innovation of our economy—and again, do it in a way that is fiscally sound. I don't want to go into how we got here in the first place. Whatever it is, we have to go forward, and we must go forward in the way the American people want us to do: bipartisan, balanced, and with an eye to job creation.

Reject what is on the floor now and support the American people. We owe it to honor the sacrifices of our Founders, the vision of our Founders, the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, the aspirations of our children and our families. This budget should be a statement of values that honors all of that, and if we are to honor that, we must reject what is being proposed here today.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the consequences of this bill are so dire and the circumstances of this constitutional amendment are so far-reaching and damaging that I implore everybody in the House of Representatives, in the name of the Founding Fathers, in the name of our soldiers fighting for our Nation, for people who kept the economy the envy of the world, for the sake of our children and generations yet unborn, to vote against this rule. I have never felt this way before. The process and everything about this is wrong. They are making it absolutely impossible the next time for us to meet our obligations, and we really should not besmirch the reputations that we have as thoughtful legislators by voting for this.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we began this debate at 4:01. It's now 5:11.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation so that as August 2 approaches, we will be able to say that we have reduced the size and scope and reach of government and we have not allowed our country to go into default.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation.

I have never witnessed such a legislative and political travesty. The Republican majority is threatening to take the entire economy hostage unless we write their draconian budget—which would end Medicare and Medicaid—into the Constitution.

Throughout this week, the Republican leadership and Republican caucus have been operating in a world of unreality. The Speaker and his team have persisted in passing legislation that everyone in the real world knows is dead on arrival in the Senate.

Today, we have moved from unreality to fantasy.

We are being told that if we do not pass a constitutional amendment to end Medicare and Medicaid, then the debt limit will not be raised—the United States of America will default—and the American people will suffer grievously.

I want to remind the House why the underlying Boehner legislation is so unacceptable. At its heart, this bill is a mortal threat to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The Boehner legislation will end Medicare as we know it by turning it into a voucher program and raising premium costs to beneficiaries by thousands of dollars per year.

Medicaid will be eviscerated, throwing women and children and seniors in nursing homes into great distress.

Social Security will be on the chopping block. The retirement age will be raised and benefits will be cut.

And under a balanced budget amendment, Congress will be placed in a straightjacket and the government will not be able to respond to compelling humanitarian and public health needs in times of economic downturns.

This is not the moment to engage in fantasy. This House must take its responsibilities seriously and do its proper duty for the nation.

The bill before us, with the poison pill of a balanced budget amendment, is a vicious assault on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, along with public health, scientific research and environmental protection.

I urge the defeat of this rule and the terrible consequences that will flow from it.

Mr. DREIER. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the “ayes” appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 187, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]

YEAS—239

Adams	Goodlatte	Nunnelee
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Akin	Gowdy	Palazzo
Alexander	Granger	Paul
Amash	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Austria	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barletta	Grimm	Pitts
Bartlett	Guinta	Platts
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Bass (NH)	Hall	Pompeo
Benishke	Hanna	Posey
Berg	Harper	Price (GA)
Biggert	Harris	Quayle
Bilbray	Hartzler	Reed
Blirakis	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth	Reichert
Black	Heck	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Bonner	Herger	Rigell
Bono Mack	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Boustany	Huelskamp	Robby
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Jenkins	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp	Jones	Ross (FL)
Campbell	Jordan	Royce
Canseco	Kelly	Runyan
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	King (NY)	Scalise
Carter	Kingston	Schilling
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schmidt
Chabot	Kline	Schock
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schweikert
Coble	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cole	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lankford	Sessions
Cravaack	Latham	Shimkus
Crawford	LaTourette	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Long	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lucas	Southerland
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stivers
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Stutzman
Dreier	E.	Sullivan
Duffy	Mack	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Thornberry
Ellmers	Marino	Tiberi
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner
Fincher	McClintock	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Walberg
Flake	McHenry	Walden
Fleischmann	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McKinley	Webster
Flores	McMorris	West
Forbes	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Meehan	Whitfield
Fox	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Galegley	Miller, Gary	Womack
Gardner	Mulvaney	Woodall
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gerlach	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gibson	Noem	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	
Gohmert	Nunes	

NAYS—187

Ciilline	Hoyer	Peterson
Clarke (MI)	Inslee	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Price (NC)
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Clyburn	(TX)	Rangel
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Conyers	Kaptur	Richmond
Cooper	Keating	Ross (AR)
Costa	Kildee	Rothman (NJ)
Costello	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Critz	Kucinich	Rush
Crowley	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
DeLauro	Loebach	Schrader
Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz
Dicks	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lujan	Scott, David
Doggett	Lynch	Serrano
Donnelly (IN)	Maloney	Sewell
Doyle	Markey	Sherman
Edwards	Matheson	Shuler
Ellison	Matsui	Sires
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Eshoo	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Farr	McDermott	Stark
Fattah	McGovern	Sutton
Filner	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	Meeks	Tierney
Garamendi	Michaud	Tonko
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Townes
Green, Al	Miller, George	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Moore	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Moran	Velázquez
Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)	Vislosky
Hahn	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Hanabusa	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Schultz
Heinrich	Olver	Watt
Higgins	Owens	Waxman
Himes	Pallone	Welch
Hinojosa	Pascarella	Wilson (FL)
Hirono	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Hochul	Payne	Wu
Holden	Pelosi	Yarmuth
Holt	Perlmutter	
Honda	Peters	

NOT VOTING—6

Baca	Hinchey	Speier
Giffords	Pingree (ME)	Waters

□ 1735

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” Messrs. NEUGEBAUER and FLEMING changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will now resume on the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, July 28, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) had 1 minute of debate remaining on the bill.

Pursuant to House Resolution 383, the further amendment printed in House Report 112-187 is adopted.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 301, in the matter proposed to be inserted as section 3101A(a)(2)(A) of title 31, United States Code, strike “is greater than

\$1,600,000,000,000" and insert "is greater than \$1,600,000,000,000 and the Archivist of the United States has submitted to the States for their ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to a joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. My colleagues, I would like to cut through all the fog here rather quickly.

Today's GDP figures remind us that our economy is still not creating enough jobs. Americans are worried about finding work. They are worried about our economy, and they are worried about the mountain of debt that is facing them and their children.

Today, we have a chance to end this debt limit crisis. With this bill, I think we are keeping our promise to the American people that we will cut spending by more than the amount of the increase in the debt limit. The Congressional Budget Office has certified this commonsense standard, and it has been backed by more than 150 distinguished economists from across the country.

We are also imposing caps to restrain future spending to stop the expansion of government while giving our economy a chance to grow and create jobs, and we are advancing the great cause of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

What this bill now says is that before the President can request an additional increase in the debt limit, two things have to happen: A joint committee of the Congress must produce spending cuts larger than the increase in the debt limit, and both Houses of the Congress must send to the States a balanced budget amendment.

Listen, the balanced budget amendment, it's time for this to happen. It enjoys support in both Houses of this Congress, and it enjoys bipartisan and widespread support across our country.

The bill also ends this crisis without raising taxes, which would cripple our economy, and there are no gimmicks. There are no smokescreens here that represent the old and comfortable way of doing things.

Now, the bill before us still isn't perfect. No Member would argue that it is. It's imperfect because it reflects an honest and sincere effort to end this crisis by sending a bill over to the Senate that at one time was agreed to by the bipartisan leadership of the United States Senate.

And to my colleagues in the Senate, if they were here, I would say this, if this bill passes, this House has sent you not one, but two different bills to cut spending by trillions of dollars over the next decade while providing an immediate increase in the debt limit. And to

the American people, I would say, we have tried our level best. We have done everything we can to find a commonsense solution that could pass both Houses of Congress and end this crisis.

□ 1740

We have tried to do the right thing by our country, but some people continue to say "no."

My colleagues, I have worked since the first week of this session when we were sworn in in January to avoid being where we are right this moment, but 2 days after we were sworn in, the Treasury Secretary sent us a letter asking us to increase the debt ceiling. I immediately responded by saying we would not increase the debt ceiling without serious cuts in spending and serious reforms to the way we spend the people's money.

We passed a budget. The other body spent over 800 days and still no budget, no plan. This will be the second bill we send over to the Senate, and yet not one piece of legislation out of the Senate has passed that deals with this crisis.

And my colleagues, I can tell you that I have worked with the President and the administration since the beginning of this year to avoid being in this spot. I have offered ideas. I have negotiated. Not one time, not one time did the administration ever put any plan on the table. All they would do was criticize what I put out there. I stuck my neck out a mile to try to get an agreement with the President of the United States. I put revenues on the table in order to try to come to an agreement to avert us being where we are, but a lot of people in this town can never say "yes." A lot of people can never say "yes."

This House has acted, and it is time for the administration and time for our colleagues across the aisle to put something on the table. Tell us where you are.

Yes, people can be critical of what we've done, but where are the other ideas? At this point in time, the House is going to act and we're going to act again, but it is time for our colleagues across the aisle to tell us what they're for, tell us how we can end this crisis.

Ronald Reagan has been quoted throughout this debate over the last few weeks, and Ronald Reagan would probably be flattered, I'm sure, if he were here. But Ronald Reagan, on his desk, had a little placard, and that placard was real simple. It said: "It can be done." I have a replica of that placard on my desk, and let me tell you, Members of this House, it can be done, it must be done, and it will be done if we have the courage to do the right thing.

So for the sake of our economy, for the sake of our future, I'm going to ask each of you, as representatives of the people of the United States, to support this bill, to support this process and end this crisis now.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a critical point in our months-long de-

bate over the best approach to addressing our country's deficit and debt and raising the statutory debt limit. It is important to be clear, that the decision to raise the debt limit is about paying the bills we have already accumulated. The debt limit has been raised over 70 times since 1960 by Republicans and Democrats, in fact, more times under a Republican president. In 11 years, we have gone from a \$5.6 trillion surplus to a \$1.4 trillion deficit. We can argue about how we got here—and I would argue the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 and the Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, all of which I voted against, are the primary reasons—but there is enough blame to go around, and the critical point now is to avoid the first default in the history of the United States of America.

The good news tonight is that we can see the outlines of a final agreement. Both the Boehner plan and the Reid plan seek to enact at least \$2.4 trillion in budget cuts with a similar increase in our debt limit. Both would set up a lawmaker committee to decide which programs to cut with a vote on the package without amendment by both the House and Senate. The key differences are the time-frame for raising the debt limit and the requirement that a Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) to the Constitution is passed in Congress and sent to the states. The Boehner plan calls for an immediate debt limit increase of \$900 billion which lasts only through the end of this year. The Reid plan would raise the debt limit through the end of 2012. Moreover, while I have voted for a BBA in the past, it is very unlikely it will receive the two-thirds vote necessary in both Houses to be sent to the states, guaranteeing a future default. I believe the Reid plan is the better approach and will vote against the Boehner plan for this reason.

We have heard a great deal in recent weeks about the potential, dire consequences of a default, notably a lowering of our country's credit rating that would cause a rise in interest rates—raising costs for people at every income level—and a likely drop in the stock market, affecting pensions and crippling our economic recovery. One thing that should be clear is that we don't want to go through this again just a few months from now. Financial markets want certainty so businesses can invest and create jobs, and I believe we will be better served to raise the debt limit through the end of next year.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very tough process. While I will not vote for the Boehner proposal today, I believe we are closer to reaching a final product that represents a workable compromise. And at the end of the day, that is what the American people expect us to do.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it has been one week since bipartisan discussions over the \$4 trillion "grand deal" broke down yet we have seen little progress toward a smaller package of spending cuts that would allow us to raise the debt limit and begin getting our fiscal house in order.

It's easy to point fingers and cast blame—and there's certainly plenty to go around—but fundamentally I believe the reason we have seen so little progress is that the American people aren't looking for a short-term solution or a small gesture. They want a "grand deal" that will put us on a fiscally responsible path today and for the future.

We all have our own ideas about our nation's fiscal priorities, but what is missing in today's discussion is a bipartisan, centrist approach to addressing our nation's fiscal health, such as the recommendations by the Simpson-Bowles National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform.

No one party has all the answers, and no one party can do this alone. It's time to put our economy back on the path to fiscal sustainability, and this House should consider the Simpson-Bowles recommendations that aim to accomplish that goal by reducing spending by \$4 trillion over 10 years, lowering tax rates, ensuring the solvency of entitlements such as Medicare and Social Security and stabilizing the debt.

To compliment the \$4 trillion Simpson-Bowles plan the House should also consider a clean balanced budget amendment. H.J. Res. 2, is identical to legislation that passed the House in 1995 with 300 votes and I plan to support it if the House take it up. It is a commonsense approach to ensuring long-term fiscal responsibility by operating the federal government's finances in the same way every American family and even all 50 states must do.

This clean balanced budget amendment, coupled with the Simpson-Bowles recommendations and a debt limit increase to get us through the next 18 months, is a package I believe would find broad bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress.

Yesterday the House debated Speaker BOEHNER's debt limit proposal, which was yet another example of the partisanship that has paralyzed Washington and disgusted the American people. Leading credit rating agency Standard & Poor's has said the Speaker's two-step approach to the debt limit could still result in a downgrade of our nation's credit rating because of the uncertainty it would create. I simply cannot bring myself to vote for legislation that would yet again call into question the full faith and credit of the United States.

With the possibility of a credit downgrade by national and international bond rating agencies looming over our head, kicking this can further down the road could mean a greater burden on the American people and American businesses in the form of higher interest rates, higher mortgage payments, negative impacts on retirements savings and higher student loans. This is unacceptable and—more importantly—completely avoidable.

It's time for cooler heads to prevail in order to resolve this economic crisis. A balanced approach that includes the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction recommendations, a clean balanced budget amendment and a one-step, 18-month increase of our nation's debt limit could be the bipartisan solution that has been elusive through all of the partisan rhetoric. With the clock ticking down to our nation's first ever default we cannot afford to wait a minute longer.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks down toward default, we are debating a bill that will not solve the debt problem. It will make life worse for 98 percent of Americans—to protect the wealthiest 2 percent of our society. Meanwhile nearly \$1.6 trillion would be cut from programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Yet, despite these cuts, under this bill, we would face the exact same crisis just six

months from now. We often hear about the need for "certainty" in the business community. With financial markets ready to tumble and our credit on the brink of a downgrade, how does kicking the can down the road for six months provide certainty?

Failing to resolve this crisis will be disastrous for our economic recovery. Capital that is already hard to come by for entrepreneurs will be even further out of reach for our nation's small businesses. That's some jobs plan.

Working families will pay \$250 more in credit card interest. Mortgage payments will rise by \$1,000. Older workers could lose thousands of dollars in retirement investment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to act swiftly and responsibly. The bill before us fails on both counts. Let's reject this measure and develop a real solution.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The Republican majority has pushed our economy to the brink of default through its refusal to work with Democrats on a balanced plan to end the default crisis. Despite the fact that this legislation cannot pass the Senate and would be vetoed by President Obama, the Republican majority chose to continue their political gamesmanship rather than bring to the floor a legitimate plan to prevent default.

By presenting a short-term fix rather than a long-term solution, the majority's plan puts our economy at greater risk of a credit downgrade and higher interest rates. American families and businesses cannot afford a higher cost of borrowing, which will raise the price of mortgages, loans, and credit card debt.

Defaulting on the federal debt is not an option. Congress should deliver a balanced plan that ends the default crisis; reduces spending responsibly; and prioritizes the health and security of hard-working middle-class families, senior citizens, and vulnerable Americans.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the bill being considered S. 627, The Budget Control Act. This bill should be called the Boehner Default Act because it is just another attempt for Congressional Republicans to hold the American economy and jobs hostage while they relentlessly pursue an extreme partisan agenda that seeks to balance the budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class. This approach has been met with widespread rejection by the public and it should be rejected by the House now.

This bill is not a serious attempt to deal with the national debt limit and it is not responsible legislation. House Republicans need to go back to the drawing board and show real leadership by crafting a plan that does not threaten the United States with a credit downgrade and higher interest rates while providing only a short-term debt limit increase.

It is inexcusable for Congress to have set up yet another partisan standoff on this issue just a few months down the road. It is unacceptable to slash Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security from our nation's seniors while asking nothing in return from the nation's most wealthy corporations and individuals.

It is time for Republicans to stop trying to score points with their political base and start legislating on behalf of the American people. As the majority party in the House of Representatives, the American people are owed better.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

On July 27, Carol Augias from Mahopac, New York wrote to me:

"Representative Hayworth, I have never written to a Congressperson before, however, I am deeply troubled by the debt ceiling stalemate. While I firmly believe that the massive debt we carry in this country needs to be reduced (I personally curtail my spending when my debt exceeds my comfort level), I am very concerned about what may happen if we default on our loans. Please find a way to get this issue resolved prior to the August deadline. Some compromises must take place. Once we have taken care of the immediate issue we, as a Nation, must evaluate our financial position so that our country will continue to flourish and children will also be able to purchase a home, afford a college education."

Mr. Speaker, Carol is right. We need to resolve the debt limit crisis for the sake of future generations. Just as the American people—like Carol—pay their bills, the federal government must do the same, so we are obligated to raise the Treasury's debt ceiling. But we must do so responsibly because our nation has another critical and painful problem that is related to our enormous debt: 14 million Americans need jobs.

We can make our economy grow, and create jobs, by assuring that the dollars Americans work so hard for are theirs to spend and save and invest. To do this, the federal spending juggernaut has to stop.

And, as Carol pointed out, there is a need for cooperation. We can reform our tax code and close loopholes, as the President has urged, and we can do so without raising net taxes. We cannot, in good conscience, increase the burdens on Americans who need a vigorous economy.

Our nation didn't reach the point of fiscal crisis overnight, and we aren't going to get out of it overnight either—but we can make progress in the right direction now, and continue doing our utmost together to bring this federal government to the right size, and empower our citizens to enjoy the freedom and dignity that is their birthright as Americans.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, many concerned Americans are fed up with a Washington system that doesn't solve the underlying problems facing the nation, including the ongoing debt crisis.

This ongoing debt debate represents not just a crisis, but a crossroads.

In the past few decades, Congress raised the national debt limit more than 70 times, usually with little or no debate. Each time very few people batted an eye and this history has been used by liberal extremists as a reason to continue with the status quo. Now things have changed.

Over the last five years our national debt has increased by more than 50 percent. In just the past three years the debt increased by more than \$4 trillion dollars. Even worse, the debt has increased by \$9.2 trillion since a Balanced Budget Amendment failed by one vote in the Senate 15 years ago. As a result, the total national debt is now nearly equal to our entire economic output.

The independent Congressional Budget Office warns that the federal government's current path of borrowing is unsustainable and could lead to slower economic growth as debt

payments consume more and more of our economic output. Add to this that the private-sector agencies like S&P that grade government debt have stated that if Congress doesn't do something to halt the rapid growth of debt they will downgrade the U.S. debt rating, likely driving up interest rates.

The bottom line is simple: the government can pile up only so much debt before it becomes impossible to make the payments without destroying its ability to fund priorities like national defense or Social Security. As the national debt accumulates at a record clip we are quickly approaching that point.

If we don't cut spending now, America will face a painful national reckoning in the coming years. This reckoning will make today's high stakes debate look quaint. That's why this debate is so critical. The longer Congress puts off making tough decisions, the more pain the nation will experience when the music stops.

So when people ask me if I favor increasing the debt limit my response is, "it depends." Any status quo increase in the debt limit is absolutely out of the question.

However, we have to consider what happens if Congress doesn't increase the debt limit. Someone will not get paid.

We cannot ignore that the government is currently borrowing more than 40 cents of every dollar that it spends. As a result, if Congress does not raise the debt ceiling the federal government would have to slash spending immediately by more than 40 percent. That would endanger America's ability to keep its promises to those who have paid into programs like Social Security for years.

Consider these facts.

If Congress completely eliminated foreign aid the budget would be reduced by only 2%.

If Congress funded only Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid as well as the national defense budget there would be no money left to pay for anything else—not even the interest payments on the national debt.

If Congress prioritized spending that is on auto-pilot, such as unemployment benefits, Social Security, interest payments and the like, there would be nothing left for the defense budget, or any other spending, including education and transportation.

That's why I'm in favor only of drastic spending cuts accompanied by a smaller increase in the debt limit. And for the first time ever, Speaker BOEHNER's bill does just that, by proposing deficit reductions of \$2.7 trillion—including \$22 billion next year. Large reductions like this that protect Social Security and Medicare for current retirees will stop the reckless accumulation of debt and help us avoid the sort of catastrophic debt crisis we will face if Washington continues with business as usual.

It's not news that no one wants to raise the debt limit. The real news is the old way of raising the debt limit is over. Raising the debt limit, as Congress has done in the past, without accompanying spending cuts would be a disaster with severe economic consequences. Washington is in debt because it has a spending problem. It's past time we addressed that and today's bill does just that.

Due to chronic overspending, Washington is at a crossroads. I'm confident that Congress can find a way to tackle this issue responsibly. It will not be without difficult or unpopular decisions. But refusing to make tough decisions today will result in even tougher ones tomorrow.

For the sake of future generations of Americans we need to make the right call today and put dramatic, permanent spending cuts in place and pass a Balanced Budget Amendment before raising the debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. HOCHUL. Yes, I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Hochul moves to recommit the bill (S. 627) to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Amend section 401(b)(3)(B) by adding at the end the following new clause:

(vi) **PRIORITIZE DEFICIT REDUCTION FROM CORPORATE SUBSIDIES BEFORE CUTTING EDUCATION.**—The joint committee shall first consider the elimination of—

(I) oil and gas subsidies for the major integrated oil companies, and

(II) subsidies for corporate use of aircraft, before cutting essential education programs that are necessary for the creation of jobs, economic recovery, and investment in America's future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. HOCHUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, here we are. The eyes of the world are upon us. The eyes of the American people are upon us, but, most importantly, the eyes of the people who put their faith in us in sending us to this institution are certainly upon us.

As we engage in this debate, I will say there is one thing that is clear to me: that everyone in this room loves this great country. America has stood the test of time and risen above disasters as one people.

In the last decade alone, we've been rattled by wars, unprecedented natural disasters, and the longest recession since World War II. As we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11, we are reminded of what we can do when we pull together. We are a resilient people. But, Mr. Speaker, never, never in our history has there been an intentional disaster perpetrated by the very people who are sent here to be the caretakers of this country. That is exactly what

will happen if we refuse to take action to prevent default and pay our Nation's bills now, not 6 months down the road.

I understand a spirited debate in defense of one's viewpoints certainly, but when I look down at the copy of the Constitution that I keep on my desk, I thank God that our Founding Fathers found it in their hearts to give and take—and, yes, compromise for what is in the best interests of this country.

I can't go back to the Hillview restaurant on Transit Road in Lancaster and look into the eyes of my early-bird seniors and tell them that we didn't get this job done, that we decided to continue this game of political chicken, to dangle default cruelly over the heads of our citizens and our businesses and our economy and hold it hostage while we, as you've heard so many times, kick this can down the road again.

Mr. Speaker, am I really supposed to tell the Greatest Generation that when they passed us the torch, we dropped it because we couldn't compromise? That is why my amendment is a simple statement of America's priorities. It says, before we cut our education for our children, we first must cut subsidies to Big Oil and corporate jets.

This amendment is one of our last chances to reaffirm the values that bind us as a Nation. I know one of these shared values is our sense of obligation to create a better world for our young people to inherit, that we give these young people a better chance at achieving their dreams than even we had. The next generation will be more prosperous and more secure, but only if we invest in it now, in the human capital whose creativity, innovation, and work ethic can ensure this country remains the world's leader and the beacon of hope to others.

But, Mr. Speaker, I feel this is all at risk. Speaker BOEHNER's plan results in consequences I can't imagine anyone in this room really wants.

On top of the unconscionable uncertainty and instability we leave our economy in with this temporary fix, we're putting at risk the investments in education that are so critical for our young people to compete with China, India, and Europe on the global stage.

My amendment is about priorities, the priorities of the people we represent. Slashing programs for seniors, young people, and the middle class all because we're afraid of the influence of Big Oil, that is wrong on so many levels.

I come from a family of entrepreneurs. My mom started a small business. My father helped grow a business of four people to 3,200. I get it. I know what it takes, and I have tremendous respect for companies that have grown to be that size. And if they have a chance to have a corporate jet, I don't begrudge them; that's great. But in this time when we all agree that our deficit must be reduced, tell me why we can't ask them—Big Oil and people who have corporate jets—to give us a hand

and help this great country that made them what they are today.

□ 1750

You know, little Seaman's Hardware Store in Genesee County run by generations of the Seaman family, how is it that they pay more in taxes than the big companies that are shipping jobs overseas? I can't explain this to the Seaman family. I don't know about you, but I cannot do that.

And you know what, my constituents are hurting in upstate New York. Some of them, at a time of huge corporate profits, can barely afford to fill the gas tank to get to their minimum wage jobs at the dollar store.

There is one value we share, and that's fairness. This bill is fundamentally unfair.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this doesn't prioritize Social Security. It doesn't prioritize Medicare. It doesn't prioritize veterans. It doesn't propose one item that would cut spending. All it does is engage in class warfare and increase taxes. Vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]

AYES—183

Ackerman	Clay	Fattah
Altire	Cleaver	Filner
Andrews	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Cohen	Fudge
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Becerra	Conyers	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cooper	Green, Al
Berman	Costello	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Hahn
Blumenauer	Crowley	Hanabusa
Boswell	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Himes
Butterfield	DeGette	Hinojosa
Capps	DeLauro	Hirono
Capuano	Deutch	Hochul
Cardoza	Dicks	Holden
Carnahan	Dingell	Holt
Carney	Doggett	Honda
Carson (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Doyle	Inslie
Chandler	Edwards	Israel
Chu	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Cicilline	Engel	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	Eshoo	(TX)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.	Moran	Schakowsky
Jones	Murphy (CT)	Schiff
Kaptur	Nadler	Schrader
Keating	Napolitano	Schwartz
Kildee	Neal	Scott (VA)
Kind	Oliver	Scott, David
Kissell	Owens	Serrano
Kucinich	Pallone	Sewell
Langevin	Pascarella	Sherman
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Shuler
Larson (CT)	Payne	Sires
Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Slaughter
Levin	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Stark
Lipinski	Peterson	Sutton
Loebsock	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Lowe	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lujan	Quigley	Tonko
Lynch	Rahall	Towns
Maloney	Rahall	Tsongas
Markey	Reyes	Van Hollen
Matsui	Richardson	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Visclosky
McCollum	Ross (AR)	Walz (MN)
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Wasserman
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Watt
McNerney	Rush	Waxman
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Miller (NC)	T.	Woolsey
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Wu
Moore	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOES—244

Adams	Ellmers	Lamborn
Aderholt	Emerson	Lance
Akin	Farenthold	Landry
Alexander	Fincher	Lankford
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Latham
Austria	Flake	LaTourette
Bachmann	Fleischmann	Latta
Bachus	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Barletta	Flores	LoBiondo
Barrow	Forbes	Long
Bartlett	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barton (TX)	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Benish	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Berg	Gallegly	E.
Biggart	Gardner	Mack
Bilbray	Garrett	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Gerlach	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Marino
Black	Gibson	Matheson
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Bonner	Gohmert	McCaul
Bono Mack	Goodlatte	McClintock
Boren	Gosar	McCotter
Boustany	Gowdy	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Granger	McKeon
Brooks	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Broun (GA)	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Buchanan	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Buerkle	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Burgess	Grimm	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Camp	Hall	Mulvaney
Campbell	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Canseco	Harper	Myrick
Cantor	Harris	Neugebauer
Capito	Hartzler	Noem
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Cassidy	Hayworth	Nunes
Chabot	Heck	Nunnelee
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Olson
Coble	Herger	Palazzo
Coffman (CO)	Herrera Beutler	Paul
Cole	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Costa	Hultgren	Pence
Crawford	Hunter	Petri
Crenshaw	Hurt	Pitts
Cuellar	Issa	Platts
Culberson	Jenkins	Poe (TX)
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pompeo
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Posey
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Quayle
Dold	Kelly	Reed
Dreier	King (IA)	Rehberg
Duffy	King (NY)	Reichert
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Renacci
Duncan (TN)	Kinzing (IL)	Ribble
	Kline	Rigell
	Labrador	Rivera

Roe (TN)	Scott (SC)	Tipton
Rogers (AL)	Scott, Austin	Turner
Rogers (KY)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Rogers (MI)	Sessions	Walberg
Rohrabacher	Shimkus	Walfield
Rokita	Shuster	Walsh (IL)
Rooney	Simpson	Webster
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	West
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Ross (FL)	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Royce	Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Runyan	Stearns	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Wolf
Scalise	Stutzman	Womack
Schilling	Sullivan	Woodall
Schmidt	Terry	Yoder
Schock	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Schweikert	Thornberry	Young (FL)
	Tiberi	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Baca	Hinchey	Waters
Giffords	Speier	

□ 1809

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2213 and H.R. 789, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 210, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

AYES—218

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Cole	Griffin (AR)
Akin	Conaway	Griffith (VA)
Alexander	Crawford	Grimm
Austria	Crenshaw	Guinta
Bachus	Culberson	Guthrie
Barletta	Davis (KY)	Hall
Bartlett	Denham	Hanna
Barton (TX)	Dent	Harper
Bass (NH)	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Benish	Dold	Hartzler
Berg	Dreier	Hastings (WA)
Biggart	Duffy	Hayworth
Bilbray	Duncan (TN)	Heck
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Herger
Black	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Boehner	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bonner	Flake	Hunter
Bono Mack	Fleischmann	Hurt
Boustany	Fleming	Issa
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jenkins
Brooks	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Kelly
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Kingston
Calvert	Gardner	Kinzing (IL)
Camp	Garrett	Kline
Campbell	Gerlach	Labrador
Canseco	Gibbs	Lamborn
Cantor	Gibson	Lance
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Landry
Carter	Gohmert	Lankford
Cassidy	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Chabot	Gosar	Latta
Coble	Granger	Lewis (CA)

LoBiondo	Petri	Sensenbrenner	Sires	Towns	Waxman	Conaway	Hirono	Murphy (PA)
Long	Pitts	Sessions	Slaughter	Tsongas	Welch	Connolly (VA)	Hochul	Myrick
Lucas	Platts	Shimkus	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)	Conyers	Holden	Nadler
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Shuster	Southerland	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)	Cooper	Holt	Napolitano
Lummis	Pompeo	Simpson	Stark	Visclosky	Woolsey	Costa	Honda	Neal
Lungren, Daniel	Posey	Smith (NE)	Sutton	Walsh (IL)	Wu	Costello	Hoyer	Neugebauer
E.	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth	Courtney	Huelskamp	Noem
Manzullo	Quayle	Smith (TX)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman		Cravaack	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Marchant	Reed	Stearns	Tierney	Schultz		Crawford	Hultgren	Nunes
Marino	Rehberg	Stivers	Tonko	Watt		Crenshaw	Hunter	Nunnelee
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Stutzman				Critz	Hurt	Olson
McCaul	Renacci	Sullivan	Baca	Hinchey	Waters	Crowley	Inslee	Olver
McCotter	Ribble	Terry	Giffords	Speier		Cuellar	Israel	Owens
McHenry	Rigell	Thompson (PA)				Culberson	Issa	Palazzo
McKeon	Rivera	Thornberry				Cummings	Issa	Pallone
McKinley	Roby	Tiberi				Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Tipton				Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Turner				Davis (KY)	Jenkins	Paulsen
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Upton				DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Walberg				DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Pearce
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Walden				DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Pelosi
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Webster				Denham	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Miller, Gary	Rooney	West				Dent	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland				DesJarlais	Jones	Peters
Myrick	Roskam	Whitfield				Deutsch	Jordan	Peterson
Neugebauer	Ross (FL)	Wittman				Dicks	Kaptur	Petri
Noem	Royce	Wolf				Dingell	Keating	Pingree (ME)
Nugent	Runyan	Womack				Doggett	Kelly	Pitts
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Woodall				Dold	Kildee	Platts
Nunnelee	Scalise	Yoder				Kind	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Olson	Schilling	Young (AK)				Donnelly (IN)	King (NY)	Polis
Palazzo	Schmidt	Young (FL)				Doyle	Kingston	Pompeo
Paulsen	Schock	Young (IN)				Dreier	Kinzie (IL)	Posay
Pearce	Schweikert					Duffy	Kissell	Price (GA)
Pence	Scott, Austin					Duncan (SC)	Kline	Price (NC)
						Duncan (TN)	Kucinich	Quayle
						Edwards	Labrador	Quigley
						Ellison	Lamborn	Rahall
						Ellmers	Lance	Rangel
						Emerson	Landry	Reed
						Engel	Langevin	Reichert
						Eshoo	Lankford	Renacci
						Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
						Farr	Larson (CT)	Ribble
						Fattah	Latham	Richardson
						Filner	LaTourette	Richmond
						Fincher	Latta	Rigell
						Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)	Rivera
						Flake	Levin	Roby
						Fleischmann	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
						Fleming	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
						Flores	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
						Forbes	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
						Fortenberry	Loebach	Rohrabacher
						Fox	Long	Rokita
						Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rooney
						Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
						Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
						Fudge	Lujan	Ross (AR)
						Garamendi	Lummis	Ross (FL)
						Gardner	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman (NJ)
						Garrett	E.	Roybal-Allard
						Gerlach	Lynch	Royce
						Gibbs	Mack	Runyan
						Gibson	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
						Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Rush
						Gonzalez	Marino	Ryan (OH)
						Goodlatte	Markey	Ryan (WI)
						Gosar	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
						Gowdy	Matsui	T.
						Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
						Graves (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
						Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scalise
						Green, Al	McClintock	Schakowsky
						Green, Gene	McCollum	Schiff
						Griffin (AR)	McCotter	Schilling
						Griffith (VA)	McDermott	Schmidt
						Grimm	McGovern	Schock
						Guinta	McHenry	Schrader
						Guthrie	McIntyre	Schwartz
						Gutierrez	McKeon	Schweikert
						Hahn	McKinley	Scott (SC)
						Hall	McMorris	Scott (VA)
						Hanabusa	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
						Hanna	McNerney	Scott, David
						Harper	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
						Harris	Meeks	Serrano
						Hartzer	Mica	Sessions
						Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Sewell
						Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Sherman
						Hayworth	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
						Heck	Miller (NC)	Shuler
						Heinrich	Miller, Gary	Shuster
						Hensarling	Miller, George	Simpson
						Herger	Moore	Sires
						Herrera Beutler	Moran	Slaughter
						Higgins	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
						Himes	Murphy (CT)	Smith (NJ)
						Hinojosa		

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1825

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to attend today's floor proceedings, I would have voted "no" on S. 627—Speaker BOEHNER's Short Term Default Act.

SERGEANT JASON W. VAUGHN
POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2213) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the "Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

AYES—420

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Canseco
Adams	Bishop (NY)	Cantor
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Capito
Akin	Black	Capps
Alexander	Blackburn	Capuano
Altmire	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Amash	Bonner	Carnahan
Andrews	Bono Mack	Carney
Austria	Boren	Carson (IN)
Bachmann	Boswell	Carter
Bachus	Boustany	Cassidy
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barrow	Brayle (IA)	Chaffetz
Bartlett	Brooks	Chandler
Barton (TX)	Brown (GA)	Chu
Bass (CA)	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Bass (NH)	Buchanan	Clarke (MI)
Becerra	Bucshon	Clarke (NY)
Benishak	Buerkle	Clay
Berg	Burgess	Cleaver
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Clyburn
Berman	Butterfield	Coble
Biggert	Calvert	Coffman (CO)
Bilbray	Camp	Cohen
Bilirakis	Campbell	Cole

Smith (TX)	Tonko	West
Smith (WA)	Towns	Westmoreland
Southerland	Tsongas	Whitfield
Stark	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Stearns	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Van Hollen	Wittman
Stutzman	Velázquez	Wolf
Sullivan	Visclosky	Womack
Sutton	Walberg	Woodall
Terry	Walden	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Walsh (IL)	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	Yoder
Thornberry	Schultz	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Watt	Young (FL)
Tierney	Webster	Young (IN)
Tipton	Welch	

NOT VOTING—12

Baca	Grijalva	Paul
Gallegly	Hinchey	Speier
Giffords	Lofgren, Zoe	Waters
Gohmert	Maloney	Waxman

□ 1839

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT MATTHEW J. FENTON POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 789) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Main Street in Little Ferry, New Jersey, as the "Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, just tonight we passed the debt ceiling vote, and it had a very critical feature, a feature that requires accountability in our House—a balanced budget amendment.

Every day, millions of Americans sit at their kitchen tables, trying to figure out how they pay their bills. But before they write that check and determine how much they're going to have to spend out of that checking account, they first balance that checking account to know how much money is in it. But we, in the United States Congress, don't do that. We don't balance our account. We don't know how much money's in there. We just spend money.

The American public expects accountability from us. In order to have

that accountability, we need to do what 49 States in America do, and that's pass a balanced budget amendment. The first of that series of steps was accomplished tonight. Now it's the Senate's turn to pass that balanced budget amendment provision, have both Chambers pass it, and have a majority of the States ratify it. This is what the American public wants. They want us to balance our checkbook, just as they do theirs.

EVERYONE SHOULD SACRIFICE FOR OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there's something missing in this entire debate. Over the course of the last 30 years, in the 1970s, if you would have seen the real income for the top 1 percent, it accounted for about 9 percent of real income. Today the top 1 percent accounts for 25 percent of real income. The top 400 wealthiest people in the United States of America pay a tax rate of 17 percent, while the fellow in Youngstown, Ohio, is paying a much higher tax rate.

The sky is falling, and the Republican Party wants to make all these huge decisions about how we need to fix our country. We need the wealthiest in our country to become patriots and step up to bat and help us solve this problem. Everyone here is being asked to sacrifice. The military, the middle class, the parents trying to send their kids to college with Pell Grants, the schools that get title I, all are being asked to sacrifice but for the top 1 percent of the wealthiest people in this country. It is absent from this debate.

It is irresponsible for us to continue this process without asking the wealthiest in the United States of America, who have been blessed to live in this country, to help us solve this problem.

PERMANENT ACCOUNTABILITY FROM WASHINGTON

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening is a moment in history. Very few times does this House vote to advance an amendment to the United States Constitution, but we did it today. And the gentlelady from Ohio, she just talked about what Americans talk about at home. It's about balancing your checkbook. It's about not spending more than you take in. We don't have a problem with too few taxes here in Washington. We have a problem with too much spending. Mr. Speaker, we still borrow 41 cents out of every \$1, and we're borrowing a lot of that money from the Chinese.

What this bill we passed tonight will do is put us on a track to pass a bal-

anced budget amendment—what Americans are calling for: permanent accountability from Washington. No more spending tricks, no more budget gimmicks. Just do what every American family and business has to do. Just balance our budget.

□ 1850

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

AMERICAN ECONOMY IS NOT SAFE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House has acted. No time for celebration—it's not over yet. Until it passes both houses, the American economy is not safe.

Standard & Poor's and Moody's announced to the University of Washington and to Seattle and to King County that if there is a default on Tuesday, these institutions in my State go on the credit watch list for downgrade because they received money from the United States Government, and there is no certainty that the United States Government is going to pay its debts. This is a question about whether the United States is going to be viewed in the world as being responsible and paying their debts.

It's not about the future; it's about what we have already contracted, and this House, led by the Republicans, has put every State, every county, every city, every university that writes bonds for their financing at risk.

It's going to cause people to pay more in the State of Washington and in every other State because of this foolishness. We need a clean lifting of the debt limit.

DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much. This evening I am going to be joined by several of my colleagues. And as they come to the microphone, let me just lay down some of the facts.

Not more than an hour ago this Chamber voted on Speaker BOEHNER's proposal to deal with the debt limit. Very interesting comments that he made prior to the speech—and while I can't quote them precisely—he did say

that his whole strategy started way back in January when he told the President that he was going to use the debt limit as a way of getting his way.

Well, we saw what his way is, and that's what was voted on today without any support at all from the Democrats and a lot of Republicans saying that it was not the right way to go.

So what did he propose? We have two very, very basic paths that are facing the American public today. One of those paths is a path that we voted on, which is a path to basically unravel most of the things that America holds dear.

In order to carry out the caps and the \$2.5 trillion in reductions that are in that legislation, we would have to decimate Medicare. There is no way it could possibly continue to provide the services to our seniors and similarly Medicaid, of which 70 percent of that money goes to seniors who are in nursing homes. And so those two critical parts of the foundation of the American society—that is providing health care to our seniors and the aged, blind, and disabled—are going to get unraveled as a result of the legislation that passed.

Similarly, there is no way to meet those spending reductions without going after Social Security. The other path is one that we have suggested on the Democratic side, and we are going to spend some time talking about these two today, and that is the path that maintains these pillars of the society of America that basically express the values of our country, that our country is one that cares deeply about our citizens, whether they are aged, seniors who may need medical care and who need an income, Social Security and Medicare, or whether they are young children that need an education and those in between that need jobs.

That's the path that the Democrats have offered in the budget that we put forth on this floor that we voted on, that was our recommendation on how to move forward. It failed without any Republican support, but it was a path that basically spoke to the values of this Nation that we have held dear for these many, many years.

I would like to turn now to my colleagues here. I would like to start with my colleague from Oregon, PETER DEFAZIO.

PETER, I know that you have some remarks that you would like to share with us this evening.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Thanks, JOHN. Thanks for helping organize this response to the Republicans.

We do have one real and prevailing crisis in America. It's been with us now since 2008, and that's a jobs crisis. There are probably 20 million Americans who are unemployed, underemployed in this country when you get to the real numbers.

Now, credible economists say if we could find a way to put those people or most of those people back to work and get unemployment down from 9.6 na-

tionally to, say, 4.5 or 5 percent, that would solve a quarter, a quarter of this deficit and debt crisis. That would be \$2.5 trillion over 10 years.

Now, the Republicans here have proposed \$2.7 trillion of cuts over 10 years. So if we could put people back to work, we would have about the same savings.

Then, you know, if we got people back to work and healed the economy a bit, all we have to do, and I talked about this earlier this week, is nothing. Let the Bush tax cuts expire. Go back to the bad old days of Bill Clinton, 3.8 percent unemployment, paying down debt, the rich paying a fair share. Those were the bad old days, according to the Republicans, because those job creators were paying some taxes.

Oh, my God, billionaires required to pay taxes at the rate equal to or higher than their secretaries and the janitors. Can you imagine that? Oh, what disaster. So, now, they are not only cutting programs and ignoring the jobs crisis, they are making the jobs crisis worse.

Last week, they ended the Federal Aviation Administration construction program for safety and security. They stopped collecting the tax. The Republicans stopped collecting the tax. It's a user paid-for system on airline tickets. That's \$30 million a day. Most airlines have taken it as a windfall. So the Republicans' mantra that if we lower taxes on corporations they will pass it through to the consumers—no, sorry suckers. They keep the money and you pay the same.

But then the other mantra is, well, if we get rid of taxes, we will create jobs. That's how you create jobs, by cutting programs and cutting taxes.

Interesting. We have cut taxes on the airline industry by \$30 million a day, \$210 million a week. That's well over—you know, that's a lot of money on a year's basis, over a billion dollars. And guess what? We have lost 94,000 jobs; 4,000 jobs of people in the FAA who oversee the safety and security construction program to make sure taxpayers get a fair value for their dollar and 90,000 private-sector construction jobs across America.

And guess what? The American public doesn't know it yet, but this could well lead to either, you know, opening the door to terrorist attack because we don't do some of the security programs, or causing a runaway incursion because we don't finish the runaway incursion program before the bad weather in the winter, or I don't get my instrument landing system in Coos Bay, North Bend, before the winter and a plane goes awry, we could have people die because of that. But to them this is all good—we are giving people back their money, or we are giving the corporations the money, and don't worry.

We need to focus on jobs. There is nothing that they have been doing here for the last 6 months, 8 months, 7 months, however long they have been in power—it seems like 10 years—that has created a single job. In fact, they

have cost us jobs. They are costing us jobs at an ever accelerating rate, and now they want to cut one other, just one other point. They want to cut all investment in transportation by 35 percent. That's an immediate loss of 600,000 private-sector jobs.

It means we won't deal with the 150,000 bridges of the national highway system that need rebuilding. We won't deal with the half of the payment on the national highway system that needs redoing. We won't deal with the \$70 billion backlog for new equipment for our transit systems, transit systems that are so decrepit in places like the Nation's Capital that people are being killed. We won't deal with any of that.

□ 1900

We won't put millions of people to work building new transit vehicles or new buses or bridges with steel and all those things with Buy America.

The Republicans say, well, we'll just give the corporations the money and the rich people the money and they'll trickle down on the rest of us. Well, we've been pretty well trickled down upon for way too long. It's time for new priorities. And I would reject the Republican agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DEFAZIO, thank you very much. You clearly pointed out the dichotomy between the Democratic proposal, which is one of building and creating and putting together a society and an economy that actually works, and the Republicans seem to be just dismantling time after time.

I would like now to turn to Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON, our colleague from the State of Ohio, who has seen the effect of the cuts and what they mean in her district.

So, Ms. SUTTON, if you would care to share with us your thoughts.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. You have been a stalwart; and, boy, do we need leadership at this point.

Here we are, it's been 29 weeks, more than 200 days since the Republicans took over the majority of the House, and not only have they not done anything to create jobs or help working families. Here we are today looking at what they have done.

What have they done? After walking away from the table five times in negotiations to restore our Nation's fiscal health, House Republicans have passed a bill today to kick the can down the road so we can continue to have this debate over again in a matter of months. But make no mistake, this is a political dodge. Republicans could not agree on a long-term solution within their own ranks, so they just decided to take a vote on a bill that kicks the can down the road that they know there is not support for, and it's a part of this pattern.

What have they been doing in this over 200 days? They have an agenda that aims to end Medicare, that guts

Medicaid, that has threatened Social Security, and at the same time they have even targeted energy-efficient light bulbs. They have used time in this body to do all of these things, while at the same time fighting to preserve tax breaks for the wealthy, for Big Oil, and for companies that ship jobs overseas when at this time we know that we have a jobs deficit in this country.

There is nothing more important that we can do than to, of course, make sure that America pays its bills, but the most important priority facing our Nation is to get America back to work because we can't solve that long-term deficit problem without people having jobs. And, frankly, the American Dream doesn't live if we don't have opportunities for families out there to go to work and take care of those that they love, to send their kids to college. That's another thing that the Republican agenda has targeted, to put college out of reach again of so many middle class families.

Well, I'm glad to be here with the gentleman from California and my other colleagues to make sure that we explain to the American people that there are people who get it, people who know that the number one priority is to put people back to work, to focus on building our infrastructure, to strengthening U.S. manufacturing, because we know that we have to be a country that makes things, that makes things made out of American iron and steel and manufactured goods; that every time you have a manufacturing job, that there is a ripple effect of four more jobs, or if it's in the auto industry, it's 10 more jobs. We know that if we are not a country that manufactures things, then we are at the mercy of those who do. It is incumbent upon us to stand up to make sure that we focus the agenda.

We've got to stop this political theater, deal with getting the debt ceiling issue dealt with for the long term, not for 6 months, not for 6 months and be right back at this again, leaving the American people to wonder, seniors to wonder whether they're going to get what they need in their Social Security checks, veterans to wonder whether they're going to get what they need. We really, really know that the priority has to be on jobs, and we implore our Republican colleagues to join us.

Two hundred days is too long; 200 days is more than the American people and the American families that I am so honored to serve can take. We must focus on getting people back to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is about jobs. There are very few economists—except maybe some that supported the proposal that the Republicans put together today—but nearly every economist in this Nation said the only way we will ever get this Nation back to a balanced budget is with full employment, putting people to work. And that is the Make it in America agenda.

Let me now turn to Mr. PERLMUTTER from the great State of Colorado, who

has some concepts and ideas he would like to share with us this evening.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from California and Ms. SUTTON from Ohio.

And as they've said, the best way to pay the debt that this Nation has incurred is for people to work. All of a sudden you've got revenue coming in, and you don't have to pay unemployment, you don't have to pay a lot of Medicaid, you don't have to pay COBRA and all these other things. You have revenue coming in and less expense going out.

One of the things about this Nation is that it has always provided to those people who really are prepared to work, who are prepared to play by the rules, who take responsibility for their lives and the lives of their family members, a chance to get ahead. That's what America has meant to millions and millions and millions of people throughout our history.

And one of the reasons this country was able to provide that kind of a setting for all of us is because 235 years ago or so, this Nation went through a war. And after that war, the States banded together and said, you know what, we as a country will pay the debts of our Revolutionary War. And this young Nation paid its debts and became a strong Nation overnight because it paid its bills. And so for 235 years now we've been paying our bills. You bet. And that's why we have had the strongest credit, the full faith and credit of the United States of America for two centuries.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, for the last 3 months or more, have been putting that credit at risk. And I'd like to say there was a real reason for them to do that, but there is no reason. When you have incurred a bill, you pay that bill. You don't say, you know what, we're not going to pay the bill unless some things happen in the future. You pay the bill, and you deal with the future separately.

But not in this Congress, not with this Republican leadership. They tie it all together and say if we don't get our way, we're not going to pay our bills. Well, baloney, that isn't how it works. And so what we've got to do is come together. The President has proposed a balanced approach to getting this country's fiscal house in order.

Now, let's not forget how we got here. Ten years ago, we had a surplus; revenues exceeded expenses. So in these last 10 years we had two big tax cuts—that's a couple trillion dollars under George Bush. We had a couple big wars, which instead of everybody being patriotic and really assisting the country, we would borrow and do it on a credit card—that's a couple trillion dollars. And then we had a crash on Wall Street—another \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. That's where the debt came from.

Now, I can lay the blame at the feet of the Republican leadership and ad-

ministration, but we are where we are and we've got to deal with it. And it's got to be done in a balanced way, both the revenue side of the ledger and the expense side of the ledger. If our goal is to pay down the debt, you need more revenue and you need less expense. And it's both sides. And you can't just say we're going to cut, cut, cut. We're going to take it out of Medicare, we're going to privatize Social Security. We're going to eliminate early childhood education. You've got to deal with the expenses, and we know that; but you've got to have revenue.

In this instance, the Republicans say, you know what, we're not going to have additional taxes for millionaires and billionaires and some corporations with loopholes, no, that's off limits. But we are going to go after Medicare, we are going to go after Social Security, we are going to go after early childhood education. That's just not right, and this country knows it.

□ 1910

Every American knows that, so we have to get busy, ladies and gentlemen, because we have work to do. If we are going to restore the American Dream, we have a lot of work to do. And that is what Democrats are going to do. We have a lot of work to do, and it is time to get busy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PERLMUTTER, you are so very correct. The American Dream, you laid it out there so well—job, family, home, ability to take care, kids off to school, good health care—the American Dream. When you get old, you've got Medicare, you have Social Security. That's really the foundation.

However, what happened on this floor not more than an hour and a half ago will destroy that dream. Now, we have work to do; indeed, we do. And now I would like to turn to my friend and colleague on the floor, sometimes we call it the East Coast/West Coast show, my friend from New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, it is a pleasure to join with you, speaking for your base in California, joining with our colleagues from Colorado and Texas and Connecticut and Ohio and Virginia, myself from New York, across this country, we are speaking for the American public. The great populous of this Nation are asking: Where are the solutions? Where is the responsiveness to a job situation, a jobs deficit, a jobs crisis?

The solution here, well, last night we saw it. We saw the drama unfold, not here on the House floor, but behind closed doors. We moved into recess. The Republican leadership of the House said we are going to move to recess. We were fully anticipating a vote last night in short order, but we waited for hours and hours. They didn't have the votes. So what happened? Today they moved for a measure that moved further from the center, took us to the extreme edge in order to get just by a

vote to amass sufficient support for a very extreme solution that really kicks the can down the road, as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) indicated. It means that we don't have this long-term solution that builds confidence in the economy but, rather, a political response, a political solution that bought enough votes, that puts into play measures that we know will not find support as negotiations need to come to conclusion in just a matter of hours.

And so this has been a disingenuous approach to a very serious issue. But what they are doing is destroying jobs, because as you kill the confidence within our economy by threatening this economy with credit ratings that could be reduced, that call for greater interest payments, from car loans to mortgages to student loans to savings to pension plans, we're putting the people of this country, every household, regardless of income strata, economic strata, at risk. But an assault certainly on the middle class of this country.

And is that the right thing to do when we have this looming dark cloud of a jobs crisis, and how do we solve that? We do it by investing in programs that create jobs and undo the programs that are outmoded, don't create jobs. And we make certain that there is an investment made in innovation, in clean energy, in manufacturing, making things here in America, taking ideas, moving them along, embracing the pioneer spirit of the people of this great land. That's not being done.

What they do is move to destroy some 700,000 jobs. They kill the confidence factor for the economy. They move forward with harmful measures that destroy our economic growth and end Medicare, because with their proposal, we see it clearly, they would end Medicare and transition Social Security into a privatized format.

These are the things that our phones have been ringing off the hook about. We have heard, through the President's encouragement, from several constituents, routinely through this debate of several weeks and months now but enhanced over the last couple of days, and people are very clear, couldn't be clearer: Why do we become a lesser priority than Big Oil and millionaires and billionaires? People are asking that question, and they have every right to.

This is an assault on the values of the middle class of this country. It is a neglectful response to the jobs crisis of this country, and it has moved us further away from the deficit situation with the debt ceiling discussion by moving it to the extreme, because the extreme of their party, in order to get their support, said over the last several hours, the last half day: You want my support, move extreme. Don't move to the moderate zone. Don't build a consensus. And so now the consequences of their action puts this economy at risk and does nothing but reduce jobs rather than promote the investments that will create jobs.

Representative GARAMENDI, it's aggravating. It is ignoring what the public's wishes are, and it's not responding to the challenges of the moment. This is a tipping point moment for the Nation. This is a chance to re-engineer the economy after a long and deep and painful recession, and they are risking that by perhaps pushing us back into a recession, if not a full-blown depression.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What took place here on the floor, Mr. TONKO, over the last couple of hours was really a charade. It was theater. It had no sense of reality. There is no way that piece of legislation is going to move forward. You said it so very well: It became more and more radical with each iteration over time.

It seems as though there is a small group within the Republican Caucus that really doesn't want government at all. Almost an anarchist attitude about government is bad, get rid of it in every way.

And then there is group in that same caucus that actually published a piece of paper, it came from the leadership, and one of the things that they said that they wanted to do was to bring down the President. Well, we have an election coming up, to be sure. But to use the full faith and credit of the United States, that is the honor and really the dignity, to say nothing of the financial strength of this Nation, to bring down the President seems to be unconscionable.

Mr. TONKO. Our goal here should be to build up a Nation rather than to bring down a President, and it is shameful to even have that acknowledged.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Earlier this afternoon before we started this 1-hour, one of our colleagues on the Republican side brought up a nice little picture of a woman balancing her budget, presumably at home, and a checkbook. She said that 40-some States have a balanced budget amendment, and they balance their budget.

Earlier this afternoon, I was talking to my friend from the great State of Virginia, and he said: Let me share with you how one State balances their budget.

I yield to BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I would like to bring that up because the legislation that we considered earlier today had a provision that required a constitutional amendment that is mislabeled. It is called the Balanced Budget Amendment.

Well, if you look at the provisions of the bill, not just the title, the provisions, you will see that it requires a three-fifths vote to pass a budget that is not in balance. Every budget that we have considered for the last 9 years and every budget that we will consider for the foreseeable future will be unbalanced in the first year. So all you've done is increase the threshold for any budget to be balanced.

The Republican Study Committee budget, which is probably the most

conservative budget in terms of spending on the table, other budgets would probably cut the deficit just as much, but all of those severe deficit reduction bills would require a three-fifths vote.

Now remember, when the Clinton budget passed, it passed by the thinnest of margins. We balanced the budget and were on course to paying off the national debt, created a record number of jobs. The Dow Jones Industrial Average almost quadrupled. Fifty Democrats lost their seats when they voted for that bill. When you vote for deficit reduction, a lot of people will be casting career-ending votes. Increasing the threshold to three-fifths will just make it harder or even more impossible to pass.

What you can get three-fifths for, once you need three-fifths, any kind of budget can pass. You can have more tax cuts, and we got three-fifths votes from the \$800 billion tax cut back in December. But a three-fifths vote, you can pass new tax cuts and new spending. You can make the deficit worse under the balanced budget amendment and probably will.

Also consider that it had the provision of two-thirds vote to increase taxes. That will obviously make it more difficult to balance the budget. Two-thirds vote to spend more than 18 percent of GDP, a number we haven't seen since Medicare was enacted. That means you're going to have pressure on Medicare and Social Security.

Interestingly, if you put all of these things together, you'll notice that you can cut Medicare benefits or Social Security benefits with a simple majority. But to save those programs with new taxes, a two-thirds vote in the House and a two-thirds vote in the Senate. And then to add insult to injury, it requires a three-fifths vote to increase the debt ceiling.

□ 1920

As if the drama that we've been through in the last few days and last few weeks isn't enough of a spectacle, they wanted to make that kind of thing routine, where we'd have to go through this every year. We've had to increase the debt ceiling on average once a year for the last 50 years. They want to go through this spectacle with a supermajority so that we can have these kinds of problems all along.

Now, we heard during consideration of the balanced budget amendment when we were in committee about Arizona's balanced budget amendment and how well it works. And we kept hearing this over and over again. So I thought, I wonder how they do that? So I Googled it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me. You said that Arizona has a balanced budget amendment in their Constitution and somehow they balance their budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And I couldn't figure out how they have done it over the past few years. I figured there must be something in there. So

we Googled it, thanks to Google. And we found out. The first thing I found out is, with 6.3 million people, they got \$6.4 billion of stimulus money that the Federal Government borrowed and then sent to them. A thousand dollars for every man, woman, and child—\$4,000 for every family. That helped them balance the budget.

But that wasn't enough. You know what else they did? They sold their State capitol and supreme court building. Did you hear what I said? They sold the State capitol building for \$735 million and sold the supreme court building for \$300 million and leased it back. That extra billion dollars in the budget was necessary for them to balance their budget.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for a second, if I might interrupt. One of the proposals coming from some of the Republicans was to sell America's assets. Do you suppose they intended to sell the U.S. Capitol?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Well, the Arizona State capitol was sold and leased back. So there's no telling what they might want to do. But the really regrettable part of this is the process that we're in. Because we just passed a bill that provides for trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts. They slapped the thing together behind closed doors. The final version was developed this morning after the bill had been debated. There was only 1 minute left in the debate, and they changed the bill. They added in the balanced budget amendment and some other kinds of changes and sprung it on the House.

We finished the debate this afternoon. Vote it up or down, no amendments. We took all that time doing it on a bill that 53 Senators have signed a letter saying that they're going to oppose it as soon as it gets over there.

Now, I said unspecified amendments because they don't cut anything in their bill. There are no cuts. There are caps. So we don't know what the cuts will be because they're just spending caps. We will find out next month what they have in mind because that's when we'll try to appropriate under the caps, and then we'll figure out what actually has to be cut.

But we'd have an idea of what they might cut because earlier this year they had a bill of about \$66 billion. Annualized, that would be about a hundred billion for the full year. In 10-year costs, that would be about a trillion. So if you want to know what a trillion-dollar 10-year cut would look like, we can see it.

Look at what they cut. They cut safety net programs like community action agencies, legal aid, energy assistance for low-income seniors, community health centers, WIC nutrition. All cut. They had investments in our future, education. All kinds of education programs, including Head Start and Pell Grants. Cut. Job training programs in the middle of an economic downturn. Cut. NASA and other scientific research, energy research. Cut.

High-speed rail, investments in our future. Immunizations and AmeriCorp. Cut.

Then routine functions of government that you would hope would not have to get cut, like air traffic controllers. They're working so hard, they're falling asleep on the jobs. Cops and firefighters. Cut. FBI agents. We spent the last couple of days in the Judiciary Committee talking about trying to chase down cases involving child pornography, and we don't have enough FBI agents to chase them down. And what do they do? Cut FBI agents.

Clean Water grants, poison control, aid to small shipyards. We have a lot of shipyards in my district. National parks. OSHA—Occupational Safety and Health Administration—personnel cut. FEMA. With all the problems we've got all over the country now, floods and everything, FEMA is cut. They talk about border security. Border protection and border security. Cut. Food inspection.

That's just a small sample of what they had in that. Then in the next bill they're cutting Medicare. All of those cut. And that's just the first trillion.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I was going to say to my friend, over the course of the last 10 years we know where the debt really came from. It wasn't in early childhood education. It wasn't in national parks. It was in two tax cuts—a couple trillion dollars or more. It was in two wars—at least a couple trillion dollars. And it was in a crash on Wall Street when people were laid off and had to have some kind of assistance.

Obviously, you said Arizona needed assistance—\$6.4 billion and they still sold their capitol.

I would yield to my friend from Connecticut because he has the chart that describes this.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. GARAMENDI, for holding this.

As John Adams, our second President once famously said, Facts are stubborn things. This chart here, which is a chart which is using the Congressional Budget Office facts and figures in terms of what happened to this country since 2002, which as my friend indicated, was the last time we had a balanced budget in this country. This chart shows that we have accumulated about \$7.5 trillion in debt. And \$5 trillion of that was due to the policies of the last administration, starting with the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, two wars which, again, lots of debate about whether it was in our national interest. In any case, what is not debatable is that we never paid a penny for either one of those conflicts.

The Bush tax cuts, \$1.8 trillion; non-defense discretionary spending, \$608 billion. TARP, the Wall Street bailout, which a lot of people forget occurred under the last administration; a Medicare drug benefit which was passed in 2005 and was never paid for. Not a

nickle of that benefit was ever paid for with either offsetting revenue or other spending reductions.

And the 2008 stimulus bill which the Bush administration had presented. A lot of people don't remember the check that people got sent during that time. Again, none of those expenditures were paid for. Many of those expenditures, such as the Bush tax cuts and the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, are still recurring expenses, which are still accumulating bills and debts which this country is obligated for.

When the Obama administration took office in January of 2009, they faced an economy that was in free fall. There were 800,000 jobs lost in January of 2009. Obviously, a crisis that needed to be addressed in terms of counter-recessionary policies such as extending unemployment benefits and some stimulus, which is to get work out there in terms of road and bridge construction projects, sewer treatment facilities. I'm cutting a ribbon on Monday morning in my district for a plant which provided a lot of work for people. Again, nonrecurring expenses to deal with the emergency that we faced as a Nation.

When you look at, again, the comparative cost of the policies and the Bush administration and the Obama administration and you think about the fact that we have these bills and expenses which have been accumulated by our Nation since 2002, and yet we had a default debate here an hour and a half ago, where the Speaker, who, by the way, voted for every single one of those Bush policies from 2002 up until President Bush left office, stood on this floor, blamed the debt crisis that we face in our Nation just on one administration, which, again, CBO clearly documents was far less culpable in terms of what the numbers show.

Again, it just shows how really corrosive the partisan debate that's occurred under the 112th Congress since this new majority took office, completing omitting the fact that eight times during the Bush administration they voted to raise the debt ceiling to avoid default. Under Ronald Reagan, 18 times. We've had clean debt limit increases. Yet this administration, the Obama administration, for the first time in American history is being held to a different standard in terms of trying to deal with the debts and obligations of this country.

The rating agencies have spoken loud and clear in terms of the bill that was just voted on here an hour and a half ago. A short-term extension of 6 months is thumbs down from the rating agencies because they see that as just an invitation this coming December to go through the same political and economic instability that we saw this past week. And that's not what our economy needs today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. It's in that context that the actions of this Congress have to be taken into consideration because last December we passed

an \$800 billion, 2-year tax cut—not new tax cuts—extending the ones that were there.

□ 1930

Had we let them expire, which I think would have been better judgment, we would not be in the situation we're in. We passed \$400 billion a year tax cuts. We now have a general consensus that we need, in the next 10 years, \$4 trillion worth of savings, deficit reduction, about \$400 billion a year, exactly the same as what we did in tax cuts last year. All of these cuts we're talking about are necessary to partially offset the fact that we extended the tax cuts last year. And the process was all up or down. You had to vote it all up or down, one vote, without any choices. We didn't need to extend all of the tax cuts. Maybe if we extended some but not all, we could have avoided cuts in Head Start, in food inspectors, firefighters and those kinds of things. We didn't make the choice step by step. It was, we have to extend the tax cuts, and in order to preserve those tax cuts, we're making the cuts in Medicare and Social Security and Pell Grants and Head Start, clean water grants, poison control, and on and on. It's in that context that these cuts are so regrettable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might, my good colleague from Virginia, on the floor today it was perfectly clear that the Republicans are refusing to even consider any increases in taxes or the elimination of tax breaks, on oil, on corporations that send jobs overseas, it's no. On the high end, the hedge fund managers that have a billion dollars of income, no, they're going to keep those tax breaks.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. On that point, if we do nothing and let them expire—we're not talking about new tax cuts—if we just let them expire, we have enough deficit reduction on the table to match Simpson-Bowles.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There you have it.

Our colleague from Ohio, if you could comment. We're going to do this kind of moving along more rapidly. We've got several different comments. Our colleague from Texas is back.

Please, if you would, and then I'll turn to our colleague from Texas.

Ms. SUTTON. I just want to say one more time, because I know that the people that I represent in northeast Ohio, they don't want government on their backs but they do want government on their side, and how do we show that we're on their side? We focus on the issue that matters to them the most, and all they want is a chance. They want a chance at that American Dream.

How do we do that? We do that by focusing on jobs, and we do that by focusing on this agenda to Make It in America. What does that mean? It means policies that make sense regarding trade, that instead of fighting to protect companies as the Republicans are through this whole default debacle, in-

stead of protecting those companies that ship jobs overseas, we want to level the playing field, to allow our manufacturers and our workers to fairly compete because we know that they are the best in the world and given a chance, a fair chance, they will not only compete, they will out-compete anybody in the world. We need tax policies that make sense. We need to focus on not only manufacturing but building our infrastructure. The world is working on building their infrastructure, and here we are, we heard the cuts that are going on aimed at our infrastructure.

It is time, it is past time, that we turn to the hard work of putting America back to work, because while we have a jobs deficit, we don't have a deficit of work that needs to be done. Let us get away from this risk of default, let us settle the matter, allow America to pay its bills, because if we don't, we're going to lose even more jobs. Economists tell us we're going to lose 700,000 more jobs if America defaults. We don't want to go in that direction. We want to go in the direction that allows our workers, our companies and our country to make it—Make It in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And there's the voice from the central part of the heart of America from the great State of Ohio.

We know that America can make it. This is still the greatest manufacturing center in the world, and part of our job agenda on the Democratic side is what we call Make It in America.

The gentlewoman from Ohio very quickly pointed out several elements in that. I put this up while she was talking so we could think about it.

Trade policy. We can't give away our jobs on trade policy.

Taxes. We talked about the tax issues, corporations getting tax breaks for going offshore.

Energy. We need energy security. We can't afford to continue to pay all of our hard-earned dollars to the petrodictators of the world and the most dangerous places of the world. We need a domestic energy policy, a green energy policy, a clean energy policy, with the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of jobs there.

Labor policies. We talked about educating our kids. BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia talked about the cuts that are in the Republican budget when we need to educate, re-educate and prepare our labor force.

Education. In this budget that they just put forward are tremendous cuts to the Pell Grants that allow kids to go to school.

Research. Again, BOBBY, you talked about the research cuts, and the infrastructure we've talked about several times. This is all part of our agenda. This is how we're going to build America, how the American Dream can become a reality once again by making the critical investments on the public side, bringing the private side along.

I know that Texas likes to say everything is great in Texas, but I have talked to our colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, many times we've talked to her on the floor, and it's not all perfect.

Could you share with us the view from Texas?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The gentleman from California is very kind for leading this effort, and I'm delighted to be here. We've really got a regional, national perspective here: the gentlemen from Colorado, from Connecticut, the gentlelady from Ohio, and, of course, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Virginia, and Texas.

Texas is a big State. I heard a colleague on this side of the aisle say that Texas has got all kinds of articles to talk about how great a State it is. It's a great State, but when you don't spend money on people, you wind up like Texas, being 43rd in education, or you wind up having the State with the largest number of individuals without health insurance, and so I have joined my colleagues today because I truly believe, standing on this side of the Chamber, that there is an opportunity for bipartisanship. But yet we have individuals who have been influenced by signs that say No Surrender. No Surrender. Those words were more appropriate for our Founding Fathers as they stood against oppression. No Surrender. But these words are not appropriate against the American people, that we won't surrender, no matter what happens to the American people, we in this Congress are so influenced by voices that truly do not have the concept of invest and grow, and they don't have the concept of Make It in America. What a wonderful statement about the greatness of America. Not No Surrender but Make It in America, because America is not broke, and the voices of negativism that would propose legislation that would have us cut without investment, cut without revenue, means that we surrender on the American people.

I wanted to mention that we haven't said what is happening to local government. Here is a major headline that says States Feel Pain Over Debt Impasse. We all come from the people, outside of the Beltway, and what is happening to the States is that the markets are being troubled. I had a press conference and a meeting with my city comptroller whose investments are in Treasury notes. It's not just what we do here on the floor of the House. Our cities will have a troubled economic infrastructure if the Treasury notes that they have invested in all of a sudden drop with severe, if you will, losses.

And so I wanted to say that this is more than just us, it is more than one person in a leaky boat, it is many of us in a leaky boat. Just in the last 48 hours, to the gentleman, the Dow went down 200 points. In the last 12 hours coming in today, the Asian markets

and our markets have seen a dramatic drop, and as you well know, we were here until 11 o'clock at night trying to wait until the conference, in essence, got itself together.

So let me just say that the debt ceiling from my perspective should be a clean one, but we should go forward with innovation, investment, and balanced cutting. We should preserve our Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

Finally let me say this. If the States are being troubled now and people are being influenced by the language or the words No Surrender, can you imagine what happens when 6 months from now the bill that passed with no Democrats, we would come back again to the American people, tell them to be fearful about Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, tell our students they might not have Pell Grants for the second semester, tell people in the midst of buying a house their interest rates will skyrocket, because we'll be back again trying to debate the debt ceiling, and if various draconian measures are not passed such as balanced budget amendments by three-fifths, two-thirds, we will have another default.

□ 1940

We need to be focusing on what is good about America. Make it in America. Invest, innovate and grow, and have mutually balanced sacrifice. That's what will make us great.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. JACKSON LEE, thank you so much.

We have about 10 minutes left here, and I'd like to do lightning rounds.

My colleagues, you've been so eloquent and have really brought these issues to bear, but why don't we all do a wrap—we'll do about a minute—and we'll just pass it around.

Let's start with the great State of New York. So we'll go to the east coast first.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Let me just say that the challenge for America to pay her bills, many of those bills that were accrued before this administration, is not a Republican challenge; it's not a Democratic challenge. It's an American challenge. The default crisis that is challenging our economy, threatening our economy is not a Republican crisis; it's not a Democratic crisis. It's an American crisis. The jobs crisis is not a Republican crisis or a Democratic crisis. It's an American crisis.

You get the message. We need to come together, not pull farther apart.

I represent what I'd like to call the original Tech Valley. The Erie Canal/Barge Canal were hosted in the 21st Congressional District. It provided for a westward movement. It embraced the pioneer spirit of America. Mill towns became the epicenters of invention and innovation. That same pioneer spirit is in our DNA at the very present day, today. If we invest as we know we

should, we will grow jobs; we'll respond to the jobs crisis; we'll create revenues and they'll grow; we'll cut spending required when unemployment rises; and we will solve many crises.

I have seen the region I represent grow per capita, in per capita measurement, to be the number one green-powered job growth region in the country. That happened because of Federal investment and State investment. Let's just make it in America and do sound policy that is bringing us together and not dividing us as the leadership of this House has done with their approach.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

Let's move to the great State of Virginia, down in the tidewater country.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you very much, and I appreciate your doing this.

As our friend from New York has said, we need to be focused on jobs. The other side of the aisle is quick to say that you cannot raise taxes in the middle of an economic downturn, and then the next thing they say is we need to cut spending. Spending cuts have a much larger impact on employment because, when you have an agency and when you cut the budget, people get fired immediately. There is a more immediate effect than tax cuts, which you don't pay until later on. It has a larger effect. So, when we start talking about the jobs, these cuts will have an adverse effect on jobs. We need to focus on jobs first.

We wouldn't be going through this kind of attack on our economy, on Medicare, on the education programs if it had not been for the threat to shut down the economy. This threat is unprecedented. We need to pay our obligations. We cannot default. It's actually manufactured, because never in American history has there been any serious effort to fail to pay our obligations as we've been going through in just these past few days.

We need to increase the debt ceiling in the same way we've done it every year, sometimes twice a year—on average about once a year, sometimes twice a year—over the last 50 years. Just increase the debt ceiling. We should not be jeopardizing. We should not be having all this uncertainty in the markets with what's going on here today. As that saying goes, "Just do it."

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed, we do. If we're going to have the American Dream continue to be a reality, we've got lot of work to do. We've got to put the American people back to work, and we're going to have to deal with the deficit, and it will take us a while to do it.

Mr. COURTNEY, you very well and eloquently pointed out how we got into the deficit. Please, your final thoughts.

Mr. COURTNEY. Sure. Tonight, I know and every one of us here knows there are a lot of older Americans who are watching this debate extremely closely who are worried about their Social Security checks at the beginning

of next month, and they're worried about whether their Medicare is going to be there.

What I would just say—and I know all of us agree—is we all understand that it is our solemn duty to protect a program that just celebrated its 45th anniversary, Medicare, which has made a difference to every single one of us in terms of our parents and our grandparents. We understand that we are not going to allow this political bullying effort, using the tool of the default as a device, to butcher the Medicare program. That is a solemn pledge which I know every single one of us believes in, and we are going to fight until this episode is over in order to make sure that we protect the basic components of retirement security for seniors in America, which is Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. GARAMENDI. How about the view from Colorado?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from California.

I would say the view from Colorado is, there's a lot of pushing and pulling back here, and I would call upon my moderate friends in the Republican Party, if there are any anymore, to stop this tomfoolery.

No longer can we put the full faith and credit of the United States at risk. I mean, we do have a duty to preserve and protect our Constitution, and the full faith and credit of this country is referred to at least three times in the article about the Congress in the "full faith and credit" section of the Constitution and then in the 14th Amendment. We pay our debts. We pay our bills. So I'd just say that the President has proposed a solid, long-term fiscal plan. It took us 10 years to get into this financial mess from the time we had a surplus under Bill Clinton, and it will take us several years to right ourselves, but we can do it. This is America.

Then as we're doing that, we really do have to focus on making sure that people who play by the rules, who are responsible and hardworking, have a shot at getting advanced in this world. The best way to do that is through a good job and through making things in America.

For Democrats, really our formula is to innovate, educate, rebuild this economy, and rebuild our infrastructure. That will make this country strong, and it will make Colorado strong. We love our clean energy industry. That's a good place to start.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, thank you for allowing us to really talk about how great America is—I agree with you—and we are not broke. Chairman Bernanke said fast, undefined cuts will hamper the economy, and he is nonpartisan as Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

So what do we need to do?

We need to look at our history. Twenty million jobs were created

under the Democratic Presidency of William Jefferson Clinton—and then this President, with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that we supported, 3 million jobs. We know how to do this.

What I would say to my friends is that we have the responsibility to be not “any” party, but Democrats are here to be for the American people, and this weekend, Democrats will be the ones standing in the gap for the American people. I am proud of that.

My last point is, there is no shame in taking care of the vulnerable. The last thing we want to do as we leave this place in these next couple of days with the debt ceiling in place, as it should be, is to leave behind us seniors who may be thrown out of nursing homes because we didn’t do what was right. So I say we can do it, and we can do the debt ceiling in the way that creates jobs and protects the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

I’ll do a wrap here, and we’ll be finished for this evening.

Unfortunately, the work has not yet been completed. We do need to lift the debt ceiling. We can, and it will be done one way or the other. The President has the ultimate authority under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution to simply order the Treasury to pay the bills.

All that has gone on here today will devastate the United States. It will devastate it. We’ve talked about that part of this is the requirement that no more debt ceilings will be lifted until there is a constitutional amendment that requires a two-thirds, or a 60 percent, vote to do anything. That is guaranteed gridlock. The only thing that could take place on a majority vote would be cuts. Think about that, America. In order to raise taxes, in order to end the tax breaks given to the oil companies or the rich barons on Wall Street, it takes a two-thirds vote. But to cut Medicare?—a majority vote. We’re not going to let that happen.

There is one place that the Democratic Party is going to stand, and that is: Keep your hands off Social Security and Medicare. No way. Nohow. I don’t care about all of this talk that goes on here. The bottom line is: That is a fundamental building block foundation of this Nation. It brought every senior out of poverty.

□ 1950

There’s not a family in America that doesn’t depend upon Social Security and Medicare for their parents. Now, if you want that cut, you stay there with what the Republicans are talking about because there’s no way that you could possibly carry out what they’re proposing unless you go after Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid.

We will not let it happen. This is where we stand. It’s not a line in the sand. It is etched into the very heart of the Democratic Party.

With that, I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Sunday, July 31, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, free markets, free enterprise, innovation, and entrepreneurship are the foundation for economic growth and job creation in America.

For the past 4 years, Democrats in Washington have enacted policies that undermine these basic concepts which have historically placed America at the forefront of the global marketplace. As a result, most Americans know someone who has recently lost a job, and small businesses and entrepreneurs lack the confidence needed to invest in our economy. Not since the Great Depression has our Nation’s unemployment rate been this high for this long.

Enough is enough. More taxation, regulation, and litigation will not create more jobs. Government takeovers of the economy have failed while the size and scope of the Federal Government has exploded. Washington has tied the hands of small business owners and job creators with onerous regulations and backward fiscal policies that have stalled the economy, slowed innovation, and destroyed jobs.

We need commonsense growth policies to give small businesses and entrepreneurs renewed confidence in our economy and to remove Washington as the roadblock to job creation.

America is at a crossroads, and House Republicans are committed to taking every possible step to spur private sector job creation and get our economy back on track so that Americans can do what they do best: create, innovate, and lead.

Tonight, my colleague and I will convey the frustrations of small business owners and those who have received the bad end of the stick of horrible policies created by the Obama administration.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, my friend and colleague, Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

One of my reasons for asking you for a little bit of your time this evening is one of these days I’m supposed to come

here to the floor, and we’re putting together an actual presentation of the Medicare actuarial report to walk people through, both our citizens and our fellow Members here, the reality of the numbers. But there was so much rhetoric on the floor today, and even within the last couple of hours, that it became one of those “it was time to come back here to the floor.”

These are some slides that we used about a week ago. And it was my great frustration, because how do you manage your government? How do you engage in this political process when we’re operating under mathematical folklore? We’re living in a fantasy land when you see Members walk up to that microphone, look the public in the eye through that camera and say, If we would just get rid of those incentives to buy corporate jets, if we would just tax Big Oil, if we would just tax those millionaires and billionaires.

So one more time, we’re going to actually walk through a little bit of mathematical reality so we might be able to start having an argument, a debate, a discussion that has some basis in fact instead of basis in, I’m going to say whatever is necessary from this microphone to get reelected. And it breaks my heart, but in my 7 months here, I think that happens an awful darn lot.

A quick sample of where we are at today. That’s a dollar bill. Do you see this first part? That’s 42 percent. So 42 pennies of every dollar this Federal Government is spending today is borrowed. That’s why this debate that we’re going through right now is so much more than just the debt ceiling and how much more our borrowing capacity is. It is the fact we’re buried in debt and we are crashing, being crushed under that weight.

If you go and read the S&P letters and the Moody’s letters, it’s so much more than, Raise the debt ceiling or you might get downgraded. It is, You are going to get downgraded unless.

There is a credible plan to demonstrate how you intend to bend this debt curve. That’s the real debate around here. That’s what you are seeing the Republicans passionately try to discuss with the American people and with our brothers and sisters from the other side that this was so much more than raising the debt ceiling. It was a discussion about saving this Republic.

So if you have a Republic, this government borrows 42 pennies out of every dollar we spend. How long do you think that’s going to last?

So what sort of rhetorical things do we get to hear around here? Well, let’s actually, now, do a little analysis on a couple of them.

How many of you in the last 24 hours, both either in the gallery or here on the floor with me or my good friend Mr. WEST, have heard Members walk up to microphones, shake their hands and say, No more subsidies for those corporate jets?

Okay. Maybe they’re right. But let’s actually do the math.

We borrow about \$4.7 billion every single day. And that whole piece of rhetoric, which I know has been tested through polling and focus groups so it is all about politics and campaigning and not the truth to the American people, is 15 seconds of that borrowing every day.

So one more time. We borrow \$4.7 billion every single day, and the rhetoric you hear about the depreciation on the corporate jets, we're going to need to take that away, even if it were something sensible, it's 15 seconds a day. So you nod your head and say, All right. What if we got rid of it? Great. But it's 15 seconds a day.

So let's go on to the next bit of rhetoric we were hearing today.

Big Oil, we need to take away those subsidies, those incentives to go out and find more oil. Well, let's do this. What if the math were we're going to take away those subsidies from all oil, all fossil fuels, not just Big Oil. Well, we borrow \$4.7 billion a day. It's \$2.44 billion a year. Well, that equates to a good 2.2 minutes of borrowing a day.

So let's see. So far the two prime bits of rhetoric we heard here today equal 15 seconds, 2.2 minutes of borrowing, and this is the type of solution we keep getting from the left. And the reason we're getting those types of solutions is because it's tested through polling. It's easy for the public to understand, even though it's horribly untruthful to the public that's actually trying to get their heads around the scale of this problem.

So let's actually go on to one of the other ones we heard today.

How about those millionaires and those billionaires? You know, those Bush tax extensions. All right. But let's first be honest. They're the Bush tax extensions—they're actually the Bush-Obama tax extensions, because remember President Obama did sign the extension in December.

If you were to take away those tax extensions for every American, not just those millionaires and billionaires, what does it buy you? Remember, once again, we're borrowing \$4.7 billion a day. It would buy you a good 28 minutes of borrowing.

So this rhetoric we hear from the President and around here, I know it may politically be wonderful and it's politically easy to digest, but mathematically, it just isn't the truth, and it doesn't lead you to a solution.

Because think of this one more time. The depreciation on jets, the incentives to find fossil fuels, ending the Bush-Obama tax cut extensions, and assuming—which we did in our math—that every single dime came in, that you didn't slow the economy down, you didn't raise unemployment, we used a magical fantasy number that every dime came back in and was applied straight to the deficit and to the debt, all three of the rhetorical points we heard over and over and over today add up to a half-hour of borrowing.

□ 2000

I turn to my brothers and sisters on the left one more time—and this is starting to become a habit here—what would you like to do with the other 23.5 hours?

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, we must empower small business owners and reduce regulatory burdens. Job creators are being bogged down by burdensome regulation from Washington that prevents job creation and hinders economic growth. These regulations are particularly damaging for the real job creators in the country, our small business owners. We must remove onerous Federal regulations that are redundant, harmful to small businesses, and impede private-sector investment in job creation.

The Small Business Administration has reported that government regulations are estimated to cost our economy over \$1.75 trillion a year. To make matters worse, in 2009, the administration considered adding another 184 regulations that are estimated to cost the economy in excess of \$100 million each and are likely to cause more Americans to lose jobs.

At this time, I yield to my friend and colleague from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Congressman WEST.

Tonight we're talking about small business in America, the number one job creator in America. I'm a small businessman. I'm not a career politician. It seems to me that once you come to this place and you're surrounded by pillars of marble, vast expanses of grass, and glorious monuments, that it seems to kind of cloud your vision from what's really going on back at home. We're seeing businesses right now—they aren't the megacorporations that are often talked about by our colleagues; they are small businesses trying to provide jobs, trying to be able to build a future.

I live in western Colorado. My district encompasses a good portion of the entire State of Colorado, the eighth-largest congressional district in the United States, 54,000 square miles. The number one employer there, small business. Traveling through that district, I found it remarkable. As I have stopped into those small businesses, visited with the owners, sole proprietorships, Sub S corporations, LLCs, people just trying to make a living, as I visited in those communities with county commissioners, with city council members, one message comes through loud and clear: Government is overregulating America. It is hurting our ability to truly be able to get Americans back to work.

Congressman WEST just mentioned a very important figure. In this country, we are paying \$1.75 trillion a year in

terms of regulatory cost. That is impeding America's ability to be able to get back to work. Now some of our friends always want to take that to the extreme, saying that we want to eliminate all regulations. It's not the case.

When we go back to the beginning of the 20th century, when we were starting to build cars in this country, in New York City, there were two automobiles, two cars. They ran into each other. So stoplights are not a bad idea. But the government has overreached. It is hurting small business and our opportunity to truly be able to grow America.

Let me tell you a story about a constituent of mine. He started out with nothing. He and his wife invested and they scraped together dollars and worked hard. And over the course of the years, they've been able to build a small car dealership in western Colorado. He called me up the last few days, and he said, Washington simply doesn't get it. They seem to believe that they need money more than we do here at home. And that brings us back to a lot of the conversations which we have been having over these last few days in terms of the debt and the deficit in this country. We currently have a debt in this Nation of \$14.3 trillion. Come the end of September, we're going to be adding on another \$1.4 trillion on top of that national debt, a crushing burden on the promise of America.

His granddaughter, she isn't old enough really to know how much she owes. But her portion of that national debt is now well in excess of \$45,000. If our grandchildren are going to inherit the promise of America, we have to restrain, we have to slow down, we have to reduce the spending in Washington, D.C. We simply can't afford it. The numbers are too high. Our colleagues will tell us that taxes are the answer. They like to call it a balanced approach. We need more of your money because Washington needs it more. They failed to point out that through the bills that they have passed through this Chamber—Congressman WEST and I, we weren't here. We didn't help create the problem, but we are certainly here to try to help solve the problem.

They increased the debt on the backs of the American people when they passed ObamaCare, the government-run health care. I'm concerned about that because it is hurting jobs in America. That small businessman who started that business from nothing and was able to grow that car dealership is afraid to hire because he doesn't know what the costs are going to be from the government-run health care. Well, we've got a pretty good idea—at least the upfront costs. It's costing us better than \$1 trillion. Our senior citizens, indeed, are worried about that. Through the actions of our counterparts, we saw that \$562 billion was cut out of Medicare to be able to fund that program. And starting in January this coming year, the President will appoint his 15-member commission to start rationing

health care for senior citizens. We're fighting to stop that.

Connectivity which we see in our economy. Between government regulations, excessive taxation, and having too many people in Washington who have never gotten dirt under their fingernails, they've never met a payroll, they've never created a job, they've never worked in the private sector. That's the disconnect between here and at home. We have people right now that are gathering around their kitchen tables. They are looking at the resources that they have coming in and know that they can't spend more than they take in. Tomorrow morning those small businesses are going to unlock the doors. They know that they have to spend within the limitations of the income that they have.

Forty-nine of our States live under a balanced budget requirement, just like the men and women who live in the communities of those States. Isn't it about time, isn't it about time that Washington applied the same principles that they expect out of every American, every American family, to apply to Washington, D.C.? Some will say "no." But that's a challenge—more importantly, that is the opportunity that we truly face right now in this country. We have an opportunity to change the course of American history for the better, to embrace, once again, the values that truly made this country the freest, the richest, and the greatest nation on the face of the Earth, and that the Earth will truly ever see. American entrepreneurship, American know-how, but we have to have the freedom, the resources, and the opportunity to do that. The government is no longer the steppingstone to success in this country but has, indeed, become a stumbling block.

□ 2010

This is our chance. This is our opportunity. We have many votes here, had a vote today.

This is not the end of the debate, but it is the beginning of a solution. If we embrace that opportunity, that special and unique thing that it is to truly be an American, American exceptionalism, and allow Americans to do what they do best, to innovate, to create and to build, we will be able to get this country back on the right course, but it will not come as long as we continue to build government, protect programs, and forget about the people who sent us to Washington.

Let's stand up once again for the American people, for the small business people who truly make America work and are the number one job creators in our country.

Mr. WEST. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, we know that not all regulations are bad, but so many of them are obstacles to job creation. A recent study by the Heritage Foundation found that an unprecedented 43 major regulations were imposed in fis-

cal year 2010 with a total economic cost of \$26.5 billion, the highest total since at least 1981.

The cost of regulations is a big obstacle for American job creators. But when you think about regulations, here are examples of some of the ones that can make you laugh.

The Department of Energy requires microwave makers to measure the amount of energy their products use in the "off" position.

The Environmental Protection Agency wants stricter regulations on the amount of dust on American farms.

The Department of the Interior wants to impose a fee on Christmas tree sales to promote Christmas tree sales.

When you think about how government regulations destroy American jobs, these are the statistics that will make you cry. According to a Louisiana State University professor, the Department of the Interior's de facto moratorium of exploration in the Gulf of Mexico could cost 36,137 jobs. In addition, more than 80,000 jobs could be lost due to the EPA regulations targeting the cement industry; and, finally, EPA greenhouse gas regulations could cost \$1.4 million jobs.

The American people placed an upper limit on the damage that Washington Democrats could inflict on the economy by firing House Democrats in the last election.

In January, we began to implement the Pledge to America, which is focused on providing an environment for economic growth and job creation. We voted to repeal the government takeover of health care, roll back costly Obama administration regulations, cut job-destroying spending and change the culture of Washington, D.C., from one which talks about how much more they can spend, to one which now talks about how much we can cut in spending.

The United States Congress in 2009 passed the President's almost \$800 billion stimulus package, which we now have convincing proof it did nothing to reduce unemployment. Today the House of Representatives has sent nine real-life job creating bills to the U.S. Senate, yet those bills continue to sit, waiting to be voted on, similar to the Cut, Cap, and Balance that we sent over that the Senate majority leader tabled.

I have introduced my own piece of legislation to do my part to try to reduce unemployment, The Small Business Encouragement Act, H.R. 1663.

The President continues with an economic policy based on job-killing over-regulation, the specter of increased taxes and the implementation of ObamaCare. How many more months are we going to see this stagnant job growth? We are now at 29 months of unemployment in the United States of America being at or above 9 percent.

The President has to realize his policies have failed. They have failed the American people, and it is time to go

in a different direction. The solution lies in economic taxation and regulatory policies which incentivize long-term private sector growth. We must restore confidence, provide access to capital which will create economic certainty. Now is not the time for more rhetoric on spending, borrowing, and raising taxes. Our country is in a crisis, and time is running out.

We must remember that it is those same mom and pop stores on Main Street back in our respective districts that create the jobs for our teenagers during these summer months. It is the local hair salon back home that my wife and my two daughters visit often that would be affected by the uncertainty that persists throughout this Nation.

Economic uncertainty created by our massive Federal debt, burdensome regulatory environment on small businesses, and uncertain tax policy for 2012 is slowing commerce; and we must turn the corner. Today's somber GDP announcement in the last quarter of 1.3 percent growth and the previous quarter, 0.5 percent growth, is further proof that President Obama's administration's economic strategy is not working.

Unemployment still remains above 9 percent, at 9.2 percent nationally; in the inner city and our black communities is at 16.2 percent; and, unfortunately, for our veterans, of which I am one, that unemployment rate is 13 percent.

We just talked about our quarterly GDP growth. That is unacceptable for the most powerful economy in the world. Providing certainty for America's small businesses should be the number one priority for Washington, considering they are the backbone of our Nation's workforce and the engine of our economy.

In May, House Republicans put forth a plan for America's job creators. That includes commonsense policies to remove uncertainty by reducing regulatory burdens, lowering business tax rates to 25 percent, spurring exports by quickly passing the pending free trade agreements, and introducing a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. The sooner we enact policies like these into law, the sooner our small businesses will be able to lead us out of this economic downturn.

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

□ 2020

SENATE SHENANIGANS ON DEBT LIMIT BILL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. It's been quite an eventful day here on the House floor, a lot of scurrying, a lot of things going

on in committee rooms, different meeting rooms around the Capitol today. And actually, last night, when I finished talking and meeting with folks around midnight or so, it appeared that Republicans would start today with basically not much change to the bill we had yesterday.

But we had a conference this morning, the Republican Members of Congress, and added to the Boehner bill was the requirement that before the President would get the full tranche of the debt ceiling being lifted there had to be a balanced budget amendment passed from the House—with two-thirds vote, of course—and from the Senate with two-thirds vote and be sent to the States by the Archivist of the Capitol for their ratification.

Now, it's a shame that a balanced budget amendment is needed, but if there could have been a piece of legislation that were prepared and passed that were tight enough to require always that a balanced approach be taken—no more money spent than money coming in—then we wouldn't have had to worry about a balanced budget amendment. But what we've seen over the last 100 years or so in this country has been runaway spending. And I think of the line Jim Carey had in one of his movies, "Somebody stop me," and Congress needed somebody to stop Congress. But the only way to do that, constitutionally and legally, was to change the Constitution so that Congress could be stopped from spending more money than it took in.

I was going to vote "no" on the Boehner bill as of yesterday, as of last night, but this morning, I found out that the Speaker, as he said he would, had listened to the Conference and put back in the balanced budget amendment requirement. It already had a requirement in there that there would be a vote, but we knew that the Senate had already voted 51 votes to table the balanced budget amendment. They didn't even want to debate it. And now tonight, as I speak, the Senate has wasted no time, with the Majority Leader of the Senate, a Democratic Party leader—I would bet that he has not bothered to read the bill, that he has not bothered to see what's there, and perhaps Majority Leader REID does not know that 70 percent or so of all American adults would like to see a balanced budget amendment passed.

Tonight, again, he is working against the will of the American people, just like he and then-Speaker PELOSI did in pushing for ObamaCare to be passed though a majority of Americans did not want that kind of government intrusion into their lives. Well, Democrats still control the Senate, so once again they're working their private will against the will of the American people.

So as I speak, I don't know what the tally is. It was being taken as I walked onto the floor. But I would imagine that Leader REID would not have brought the Boehner bill, with the re-

quirement of having a balanced budget amendment passed by two-thirds, to the floor of the Senate unless he knew, once again, he had the 51 Democratic Senators who were willing to vote to table the bill that has required so much sweat—I don't know that there were any tears, but there was a lot of sweat and a lot of frustration. I know I've had plenty, anger at times, frustration. But we came together and got the bill done. And I ended up being a "yes" for a number of reasons, but the most important was that the balanced budget amendment was going to be required to pass two-thirds of the House and Senate before the President got the debt ceiling increase that he so desperately wants.

To table that—it's bad enough that the Senate all this time has been trashing things that we've been fighting for and getting accomplished in the House, but to table it? You're not even going to let Republicans who want to speak on this issue come to the floor of the Senate and have a fair debate simply because one party controls the majority? You want to keep the other side from coming to the Senate floor and having a fair debate over a balanced budget amendment. It is just staggering to think that, once again, just like when ObamaCare was crammed down the throats of Americans, not with any sugar, it was a sour piece of medicine, and now, not even to allow debate over a balanced budget amendment to be brought to the Senate floor, I don't think the Founders intended that. I don't think the Founders intended that when 70 percent or so of Americans felt something was critical for the ongoing and good of the country, that you would have one group in either House who would prohibit even discussing, debating a bill, using the rules and 51 Senators to prevent debate. I mean, that's one of the things that helped make this country great.

This was the one place you used to be able to say whatever you wanted. It has been credited to different people, "I disagree with what you say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it," and now it appears the Senate is operating under the rule, "I disagree with what you say, so I am going to use procedural maneuvers and prevent you from saying what you want to say."

And I'll say this about Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, too. He knows that I have not been happy with many of the things that have gone on, but unlike the Majority Leader in the Senate, he has made no effort to prevent me from coming to the House floor and speaking my mind, such as it is, here on this floor. We're supposed to have freedom of speech, but the Senate will not allow the working of the people's will on the Senate floor.

Now, I've heard some people say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact is that by our passing this bill today in the House that we have provided a vehicle for the Senate to use to completely strip out and put some contorted piece of legis-

lation on and send back down here. Well, the fact is that the Senate did not need this bill today to have a vehicle to send a contorted piece of legislation back to us. Now, the Constitution makes clear, anything that produces revenue has to originate in the House. That's the Constitution. But it is also important for people to understand, Mr. Speaker, the lengths to which the rules have been twisted—and I think misused—in order to make something happen that never should have.

A good example is this monstrosity some call ObamaCare. It's got different names, but the original name of this bill was H.R. 3590, and it calls it: the Bill from the House of Representatives.

So this was a Senate bill—ObamaCare was a Senate bill, started in the Senate, derived in the Senate. Well, then, since the Democrats raised revenue in ObamaCare, created new taxes, introduced taxes, well, that's a revenue-generating bill, then how in the world could the Senate originate the bill since it generated revenue, because the Constitution makes very clear they can't do that.

□ 2030

Well, what the Senate did was take H.R. 3590 entitled, "an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first time home buyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes." That's ObamaCare.

And I would humbly submit that any bill that starts as a lie, because this bill was a lie, a bill that starts as a lie can't be a very good bill in the end.

We know that any building that has a proper foundation can weather a lot of storms. This bill has a lie for a foundation. The ObamaCare bill, H.R. 3590, "an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first time home buyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces." And they had to do double page, and this paper is very, very thin so they could get all of this stuff in here.

But it is interesting. You know, the bill started as a bill to help veterans and our military. But this bill, to help veterans and our military, those who are putting their lives at risk for our liberty, for our benefit, that was stripped out and this ObamaCare bill begins with page 1, line 1 of the bill to help our veterans and military, and strikes every single word, deleting every single word in the bill to help veterans and our military, and substitutes therefore ObamaCare.

That bill started as a lie. They took a bill that had nothing to do with health care, and they stripped every word that would help our military and made it ObamaCare. That is phenomenal, just incredible.

So the Senate didn't need us to pass a bill today for them to do the same thing, to take some well-intentioned bill, some bill that did some great things for America, deleting beginning

on line 1, page 1, and substituting therefore whatever contorted mess that the Senate is going to send down here.

But the thing is, although some of the Senate leadership has been taking their shots in the media at the House, they have not passed anything. They have fought now today makes twice as the Nation moves toward not having enough money while the House has been embroiled in serious debate and discussions trying to put together a bill. And we did that, and it had 234 votes. And the Senate immediately tabled it.

The truth is, I thought we should wait for the Senate to do anything. And I disagreed with the Speaker's strategy. The Speaker's strategy was if they won't take that, then let's try again. We will compromise on the things that we want and send a bill that is clearly a compromise of the things that we want, so surely the Senate will take it up and surely they will pass it.

We heard from Majority Leader REID that he was going to make sure that it was dead on arrival, but those kinds of things have been threatened before, too. We know that the President has drawn many lines in the sand that have kept moving. And we have heard the President talk about his bill. I can recall sitting back there during the September speech by the President in here on health care in which he kept talking about his bill, my bill, this bill, and don't misrepresent my bill or I'll call you out. And he was the first one to use the lie word here on the House floor talking about what he believed to be misrepresentations of his bills.

I asked the HHS Secretary a couple of weeks after that, the President keeps talking about my bill, this bill, where can I get a copy of the President's bill? And Secretary Sebelius said: I think he was talking about a set of principles.

So I was right. The President talked about this bill, my bill, this bill, my bill, but he had no bill. People talk about how beautiful his clothes were, but the fact was the emperor was naked. There was no bill. There was no bill then; and now as the President talks about his bill, his ideas, there is no bill. As HARRY REID talks about his bill, there is no bill. Maybe they will finally get around to passing something. There is something filed in the Senate, and as I understand it, Chairman DREIER has filed it down here so that we can take it up. We will see what happens.

But the phenomenal thing is how badly off track this Congress has gotten when one of the Houses, in this case the Senate, will not even allow debate over something that the vast majority of Americans want. Forget Democrat, forget Republican, forget red, forget blue. Let's get responsible.

Mr. Speaker, there is \$160 billion in deficit spending. My second year here, 2006, was not responsible; and Demo-

crats won the majority as the result because they promised we will eliminate that \$160 billion deficit spending. Man, oh, man, were they right. They eliminated \$160 billion in deficit spending. And now this year as a result of their actions, the last four, we will have \$1.6 trillion in spending deficit this year. Bringing in around \$2.2 trillion.

We find out today the numbers from the first quarter of this year, which was very little growth at all in our economy which people got depressed about when the original numbers came out, was about a third of what they originally thought it was. Things aren't looking good. This is President Obama; it's his economy. With the changes that Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader REID made in the first 2 years of this President's tenure, they set us on a track that is leading to a major crash.

Now, we have already heard in recent days that the August 2 deadline that the President set, just like I said some weeks back, that was not a particularly special day. It did happen to be the day before the President's big birthday celebration, but otherwise it was not a particularly significant day. I know that the group that Tom Daschle helped start, the Bipartisan Policy Center, whatever it is, that they were echoing whatever the President said, that August 2 was going to be the day.

And they lumped in Social Security with everything else. The law is very clear, Social Security gets paid. It is on automatic pilot. Just like in 1985 and just like in 1996, when there was a shortfall 1 month, the Treasury Secretary is supposed to sell off some of the Treasury notes. There is \$2.6 trillion in Treasury notes, sell off enough to pay the benefits and expenses of Social Security. So there is no risk of that failing.

We also know there are many times more than enough money to pay our debts as they come due in August; and so we have been told, well, actually it is not August 2. Maybe it is like a couple of weeks or a couple of weeks beyond that. We are not sure, but sometime in the future. Well, in the House it has been taken seriously even though August 2 was not particularly a magic date. We have passed two bills, and the Senate has passed zero. That's irresponsible. Absolutely irresponsible. That invokes no confidence that this government will ever be able to do what it needs to.

So I know, I have gotten emails, calls, and letters. Members of Congress all over the floor on both sides of the aisle have gotten calls and letters and emails. The majority in my office have encouraged me to stand firm. It is great to represent a district that understands not to cave in to fear-mongering.

□ 2040

It has been rough in recent days because you never like to be chided by

friends who don't like the position you're taking on a bill. But I'm ever so grateful that the bill was made eminently better this morning by adding the requirement that the Balanced Budget Act pass. And not only that, talking through the day, I do appreciate Speaker BOEHNER face-to-face, eye-to-eye. He has been very gracious all week. It's others that have made it kind of tough at times. He realized something needed to be done. He wants to do something. So, in talking with him and also talking with Chairman PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the Budget Committee, I'm also satisfied that we've got a number of wonderful things coming.

We can perhaps figure at some point the Senate will get concerned about going against the will of the majority of the Senate. At some point they're going to realize: We should not keep going against 70 percent of the American public because a lot of us have got elections next year. So, gee, maybe we better do something that the majority of Americans want.

Well, one of the things that I heard Rush Limbaugh talking about in the nineties when Congress was not even a blip on my radar was the zero baseline budget. And it didn't make any sense to me as he explained it. I thought, that's strange. As it was explained, we have automatic increases in every agency's budget in the Federal Government. Every agency has automatic increases every year. Well, citizens don't get automatic COLAs but their agencies sure get an automatic increase every year. All those budgets, they get automatic increases. Why? We ought to have a zero baseline budget every year so nobody gets an automatic increase in the government agencies. If they want an increase, they ought to have to come in and prove it. And we can save trillions of dollars if we just required every budget in the Federal Government to start out and prove what they need for the year. A zero baseline budget. No automatic increases.

Well, when I got to Congress and was sworn in in January of 2005 and started looking at the things that would make America stronger, a zero baseline budget made sense. During that Congress I filed a bill to require a zero baseline budget. No automatic increases every year. And then back in those days it didn't make sense the Republicans wouldn't bring that to the floor because any time you slowed the automatic increase as a Congress, there were people that called you a draconian fool, you're making draconian cuts, when you weren't making cuts, you were just slowing the rate of growth. It wasn't a cut. The only way to fix that was just say: No automatic increases.

And I pushed for that in my first Congress in 2005 and 2006, and Republicans were in the majority. And our leadership at that time, particularly in 2006, when I talked with some of our

leadership then, and I was pushing it, and I was told we just can't do that. We should have. We didn't. We should have had major tax reform. Well, now is the time. This is a great time to push for a flat tax or a simplified tax that's fair, simpler, and so that everybody has their fair share.

I don't want a mega-rich person paying a 10 or 12 percent income tax. Everybody ought to have some interest financially in what happens here—and not because they make lots of money and don't put anything in. People need to have a vested interest in this Congress by paying income tax in. And the lowest rate is down, I believe, around 15 percent. It may be 5 percent. I've forgotten now. But the top rate has been 39 percent. Some people want it to go higher. And even though the top rate is 39 percent, there are some mega-rich that don't pay 39. Well, why not have a tax that's a fair tax cut across the middle that will be a flat tax. Everybody pays the same amount of tax. That ought to be fair. Everybody ought to have the same thing.

Art Laffer, a great economist that helped revive the dismal economy coming out of the Carter administration, was just saying this week—I agreed with what he said. I have been talking about this, and I appreciate that man's opinion so much. He said we ought to have a flat tax. And he said, I believe you could get there and have the same amount of revenue if you were to have a 12, 13 percent flat tax, and even allow for mortgage interest deduction and to allow for deductions to charitable contributions. That was the main part of the tax. There was another aspect. But, boy, that would be so much more fairer. No mega-rich would get out without paying nothing. GE shouldn't have to pay nothing or, get away with paying nothing just because they're a friend of the administration and get lobbying and all that kind of stuff.

Everybody ought to have to pay something. I'm okay with reducing corporation tax because when you do that, you're reducing the tariff we're putting on our own products. And if you took off the 35 percent tariff we put on every corporate American good produced, there's no telling how many markets around the world would just be begging for American products that would have 35 percent less of a tariff on those goods. We could compete anywhere if we keep the tariff down on our own goods. People talk about putting tariffs on other people's goods. We ought to get it off our own. And then you would see massive amounts of economic boom going on, and people would be hired, and more people would pay the 12, 13 percent income tax. You would have more revenue than ever coming into the American coffers in the Federal Government. That would create jobs. And as people know, the best form of welfare is a job. You feel good about yourself. But it's hard to feel too good about what is going on down there.

As I have said before, down in the Senate, above the door from the Presi-

dent's sitting position, above the left door are the words "Annuity Coeptis." He, God, has smiled on our undertaking. It's part of our Great Seal on the back of every dollar bill. It's hard to believe that God could be smiling on people that will not allow debate on a responsible balanced budget amendment.

In the time I have left, let me just say we've got so many calls, emails, letters, encouragement. And so many of them say, We're praying for you in Washington that you will do the right thing. Some of us happen to believe—and I won't try to push my religious beliefs on others—but some of us happen to believe that as we're told in the Old Testament, the Lord is the source of all wisdom. That there is no wisdom outside of that. Ben Franklin apparently believed that, as he said in 1787, "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men."

Mr. Speaker, Peter Marshall was Senate Chaplain back in the 1940s, and a constituent gave me this book with many of the prayers that he prayed there on the Senate floor. I want to finish, Mr. Speaker, with a prayer prayed by Peter Marshall, U.S. Chaplain for the United States Senate in the 1940s. On the Senate floor, as the Senators are down there. It makes a wonderful prayer.

Peter Marshall prayed:

"We pray to Thee, O Christ, to keep us under the spell of immortality."

"May we never again think and act as if Thou wert dead. Let us more and more come to know Thee as a living Lord who hath promised to them that believe: 'Because I live, ye shall live also.'"

"Help us to remember that we are praying to the Conqueror of Death, that we may longer be afraid nor be dismayed by the world's problems and threats, since Thou hast overcome the world."

"In Thy strong name we ask for Thy living presence and Thy victorious power. Amen."

Mr. Speaker, may that be our prayer also tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 30, 2011, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2650. A letter from the Deputy Director, Food and Community Resources, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Nonformula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions for Biomass Research and Development Initiative (0524-AA61) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2651. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2652. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8187] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2653. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2654. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Low-Risk Assets (RIN: 3133-AD81) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2655. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Secretary for Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Promise Neighborhoods Program (RIN: 1855-ZA07) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2656. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Enforcement Policy for Certain Fire Protection Issues [NRC-2008-0486] (RIN: 3150-AG48) received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2657. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: New Premium Rating Method for Most Community Rated Plans (RIN: 3206-AM39) received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2658. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marking Meteorological Evaluation Towers [Docket No.: FAA 2010-1326] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2659. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A, 205A-1, 205B, 212, 412, 412CF, and 412EP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0561; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-16715; AD 2011-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2660. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702), Model CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet

Series 705), and Model CL-600-2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0159; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-16713; AD 2011-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2661. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determining the Amount of Taxes Paid for Purposes of the Foreign Tax Credit [TD 9535] (RIN: 1545-BK25) received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2662. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-59] July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2663. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Suspension of Reporting Requirements Under Sections 6038D and 1298(f) [Notice 2011-55] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2664. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Notice and Request for Comments Regarding the Community Health Needs Assessment Requirements for Tax-exempt Hospitals [Notice 2011-52] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2076. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the statutory authority for the longstanding practice of the Department of Justice of providing investigatory assistance on request of State and local authorities with respect to certain serious violent crimes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 112-186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 383. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays (Rept. 112-187). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1002. A bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property; with an amendment (Rept. 112-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1059. A bill to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2694. A bill to firewall the Medicare Trusts Funds by restoring to those Trust Funds funds transferred by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2695. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and intensify programs of the National Institutes of Health with respect to translational research and related activities concerning Down syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2696. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and intensify programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to translational research and related activities concerning Down syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2697. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to broaden the special rules for certain governmental plans under section 105(j) to include plans established by political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. BUERKLE):

H.R. 2699. A bill to establish policies and procedures in the Peace Corps to provide for the safety and security of volunteers from rape and sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2700. A bill to establish a health and education grant program related to autism spectrum disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 2701. A bill to promote simplification and fairness in the administration and collection of sales and use taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 2702. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the scope of the provision commonly referred to as the "Wire Act", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 2703. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the uniformed services are entitled to refractive eye surgery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2704. A bill to reduce the spread of sexually transmitted infections in correc-

tional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2705. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of quality universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SHULER, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 2706. A bill to prohibit the sale of billfish; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2707. A bill to establish trade negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures to agricultural products to facilitate trade in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the imposition of employment taxes on wages in excess of the contribution and benefit base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the payroll tax relief under the HIRE Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2710. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain tax cuts extended for high income individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2711. A bill to provide relief payments for non-COLA years to recipients of social security, supplemental security income, railroad retirement benefits, and veterans disability compensation or pension benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2694.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2695.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section

8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 2702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16

The Congress shall have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

By Ms. LEE

H.R. 2704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 23: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 25: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 58: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 110: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 190: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 191: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 303: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 361: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 363: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 399: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 420: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 436: Mr. WEBSTER.

H.R. 452: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WEST, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 456: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 458: Ms. BASS of California and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 459: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 469: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 493: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 539: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 652: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 667: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 674: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 675: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 718: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 719: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 721: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 735: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 751: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 763: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 805: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 860: Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LONG, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 894: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 912: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 942: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 972: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1031: Mr. OWENS and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1041: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1092: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1093: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1195: Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 1219: Mr. SIRE and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1234: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1236: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1244: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1259: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. RIGELL, and Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1283: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1293: Mr. POLIS and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1318: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1327: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1420: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1452: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LANDEVIN.

H.R. 1463: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1533: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1543: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1546: Mr. BOREN, Mr. BARROW, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1558: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1574: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1639: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 1648: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 1704: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1724: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1744: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1776: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1792: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1802: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1821: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1834: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1848: Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1880: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1897: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1898: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1940: Mr. LANCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1955: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1969: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1981: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2005: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2036: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2054: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2057: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 2059: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2071: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2107: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2139: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2195: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2204: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 2214: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 2256: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFALZIO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2257: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 2280: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2306: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2312: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2346: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2360: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2369: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2402: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2404: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2412: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2414: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2458: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2459: Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 2463: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2485: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2495: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2500: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2502: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2514: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2524: Mr. STARK and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2530: Mr. KIND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2534: Mr. FORBES and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2541: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2557: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2579: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2580: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2581: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2585: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2604: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2644: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. LEE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DINGELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2651: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2653: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2663: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SABLON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2664: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2674: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BERG, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 28: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, and Ms. BASS of California.

H.J. Res. 29: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr.

BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 30: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 31: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 32: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 33: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 35: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 36: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 69: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H. Res. 229: Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 295: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 332: Ms. CHU, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 333: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Res. 342: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 361: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 379: Mr. MACK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 380: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WEST, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. DUFFY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 451: Mr. CRITZ.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 83: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize an order for the pesticide sulfuryl fluoride under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a) that takes into consideration aggregate exposure to other related substances pursuant to section 408(b)(2)(D)(vi) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(b)(2)(D)(vi)).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT No. 84: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO ACQUISITION OF LAND

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, install, or manage a transit system for access to or within Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 85: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 ("Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations").

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT No. 86: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency who is receiving special pay consideration under section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 87: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for enforcement activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) against the owner or operator of any concentrated animal feeding operation consisting of less than 1,000 animal units.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 88: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop numeric nutrient standards for the Mississippi River basin.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 89: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, ad-

minister, or enforce the rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 9, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 12863 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 90: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for enforcement activities under the Oil Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Program established under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, against an owner or operator with respect to a storage container or other facility that is located on a farm (as defined in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 91: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO BORDER
PATROL ACTIVITIES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enforce any of the following laws against the United States Border Patrol during border patrol activities on Federal lands:

(1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(3) The National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(4) The Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).