

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-190) on the resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 384 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 384

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. 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 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. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, after months and months of debate, we have arrived at the ultimate goal to which we are all committed: a bipartisan agreement to avert the debt ceiling crisis looming right before us. Even more importantly, we have crafted a plan that addresses the real underlying challenge of our ballooning national debt.

The bipartisan agreement before us today is an historic achievement. Mr. Speaker, this is the 76th time that we have raised the debt ceiling since 1962. Seventy-five times it has been raised. This is the 76th time. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is the very first time that we have done so while making corresponding cuts in spending that exceed the ceiling increase. To most of us, this is just good common sense. It's the only responsible thing to do. Yet 75 times before, no connection was made between the debt ceiling and efforts to tackle our debt.

With today's underlying legislation, we are fundamentally changing the way business is done here in Washington. We are setting a new precedent for fiscal discipline and accountability. This is a tremendous achievement that will have a profound and lasting impact on our budget and our economy in both the short, medium and long term. This is an especially critical point to focus on.

□ 1500

Today's legislation has dramatic implications for both the budget and our economy. Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, the two are inextricably linked. This is why our fiscal situation is so important. We don't need a balanced budget for the sake of a balanced budget, we need to balance our budget because job creation and economic growth depend on it.

There is a reason why the major credit agencies have said that our AAA credit rating is in jeopardy if we don't dramatically cut spending. Multitriple-dollar deficits and a national debt that approaches 100 percent of GDP are not sustainable. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that. If we want to inspire confidence in the U.S. economy, create jobs, and restore our position as the world's most vital and dynamic economy, we absolutely must chart a new fiscal course.

The bipartisan agreement that we will consider today does just that. It makes meaningful, immediate spending cuts. It sets up a process that guarantees votes in both Chambers by Thanksgiving on an even bigger package. This will give us the time necessary to go beyond cuts to significant new reforms. That includes reforming entitlement programs to keep them solvent and ensure that they don't force us back onto a path of spiraling deficits and debt.

Mr. Speaker, by setting up this process, we can responsibly make the hard but essential choices that will restore

our economy and unleash its power to create new opportunities for Americans. The underlying legislation will also impose additional automatic cuts, should Congress fail to continue on a path to real reform.

Mr. Speaker, we are all in this together, Democrat and Republican alike. We all stand to suffer tremendously if we fail to either raise the debt ceiling or take this opportunity to fundamentally change course. We will all suffer if we fail to continue the process of meaningful reform. But by coming together and enacting real reform, by remaining committed to this joint effort into the future, we can all share in the benefits of a surging economy and job market. We can't approach a challenge of this magnitude as Republicans and Democrats first, but as fellow Americans who share a commitment to our prosperity as a Nation now and into the future.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from California, my good friend, Mr. DREIER, 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. Mr. Speaker, after a tense standoff over a self-inflicted crisis, I'm extremely disappointed with the solution that is being proposed today.

It's important that we raise the debt ceiling; in fact, it is the duty of every Member of Congress to ensure we pay our bills. Unfortunately, we have reached this point because some on the other side see paying our bills as optional and have asked a king's ransom for doing so. In the process, the majority has shown the world that our democracy is currently dysfunctional. Even if we avoid default, the process that got us to this point has already shown the world that the greatest nation on Earth can barely keep the lights on.

Recently, IMF Chief Christine Lagarde told CNN in not so many words that we are destroying the world's faith in our ability to be the most powerful economy on Earth and our ability to pay our bills. This dysfunction is only highlighted further by the proposed creation of a so-called "Super Committee," a closed-door committee that will determine how to cut another \$1 trillion in government spending while 523 elected Representatives are told to sit on the sidelines and vote up and down when all is said and done. I repeat what I said last week, my constituents did not send me to Congress to sit on sidelines while the most important issues of our time are being decided.

The crumbling faith in our democracy is already having an effect on our

economy. Just last week, Roll Call reported that the prolonged debate over raising the debt ceiling resulted in an increase in Federal borrowing costs—a fancy way to say that interest rates for car loans and home mortgages are higher now than they should have or would have been.

Furthermore, today's agreement does nothing to create jobs for the 25 million Americans who failed to find full-time jobs last month. On Friday, we will receive a jobs report that will provide even more evidence that while Congress has shrugged aside the urgent need to create jobs, millions of Americans continue to suffer. This bill does nothing to serve them.

The majority has steadfastly refused to consider a balanced approach to reducing our deficit, rejecting attempts to close tax loopholes for the rich and extend unemployment benefits for those unable to find work. Instead, they have decided to only consider the draconian cuts that threaten to reverse whatever fragile economic recovery is underway.

On Sunday, Mohamed El-Erian, the CEO of a major financial firm, spoke of the damage that proposed cuts will inflict on our economy. While speaking on ABC, he said, "Unemployment will be higher than it would have been otherwise, growth will be lower than it would have been otherwise, and inequality will be worse than it would have been otherwise." He added, "We have a very weak economy. Withdrawing more spending at this stage is going to make it even weaker."

Today's agreement will endanger the potential for new jobs while asking absolutely nothing of those in our country who are the most well off.

Democrats will continue to vigorously fight for Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare to ensure that not a penny is cut from the checks of seniors and working people who rely on these programs every day. It is a contract.

We believe that ultimately we must take a balanced approach to reducing our deficit. Tax loopholes must be closed, and those who have benefited the most in this country must be asked to pay their fair share. And regardless of the outcome of today's bill, these are the priorities for which I will continue to fight.

Especially as the debt debate continues, I urge my colleagues to look towards a balanced approach and return this country to its rightful place as a shining example of democracy and equality for which we should once again aspire.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that this is a very unique moment for us. We have the ability to come together at a time when we are faced with a deadline. That deadline, as we all know, is midnight tomorrow.

The commitment that has been made to Social Security, Medicare, our veterans, and other programs is one which

we, as Republicans, clearly stand by. And I've got to say that we know that since those programs have been put into place, when it comes to Social Security and Medicare, every working American has been forced to pay into the Medicare and Social Security funds through their FICA tax. By virtue of that contract that we have, we stand here strongly committed—contrary to what many people may say—to ensuring the solvency and the strength of Social Security for today's retirees and future generations as well. And I believe that this package that we have here today, that will enjoy bipartisan support, reaffirms that exact commitment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, I'm voting against the rule because, in the later years in this Congress, I've seen a whole lot of things, but it's never been this polarized, it's never been in terms of attacking a President, and it's never been risking the whole fiscal credibility of the great United States of America in order to make political gains.

Clearly, when everyone talks about everyone must make a sacrifice, I assume that we're talking about a sacrifice in cutting the budget, not receiving the benefits; the protections of some programs and not others. And then on the other side, I have to pause because I don't see any sacrifice. It's assumed by the general public that the sacrifice means that maybe if you became wealthy under the great support that you received from this country, that you'll make some small sacrifice; or maybe that sacrifice could be interpreted as that when you received preferential treatment in the Tax Code for all of these years, that you're willing to say I don't need it now, you were there when I needed you.

□ 1510

But I think it's safe to say that the American people will be making sacrifices, and they're making it for a crisis that they're so far away from.

The people that enjoyed the crisis in terms of financial gain are not asked even to say "I'm sorry." And the people that really love, respect, and hope, and dream, that lost their homes and their jobs, their self-esteem, these are the ones that will make further sacrifices. Only this time it won't be the executive branch. It certainly won't be the courts. It would be our own colleagues, from the Senate and from the House. A group of "super members" will go into a room to decide for us what the next trillions of dollars is going to be cut from a budget.

And if they can't succeed, then there would be an automatic cut right across

the board regardless of whether or not some programs should survive and others should be abolished.

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

Mr. DREIER. May I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this great committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the patriotism that you have shown not only to the committee and the Republican Party but to this great country over the years.

I'm just so sorry on this great occasion that you would take your chairmanship to produce a rule like this that Americans cannot see their way clear to say this has been fair and this has been equal.

I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you so much.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend, and I would like to have a discussion with him, if I might. I would yield an additional 30 seconds and ask him to yield to me, especially if he wants to continue.

Mr. RANGEL. I'm so sorry.

Mr. DREIER. I yielded time to my friend and then asked him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. Oh, yes, I didn't understand you had made that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield an additional 30 seconds, and I would hope that he would continue what he was saying in the first half of his presentation about me rather than the last half.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that it is very clear that what we have before us is in fact a bipartisan agreement to do exactly what my friend at the end of his statement was saying. We want very much to ensure that people are able to keep their homes. We want to ensure that people are able to see their businesses thrive. We want job opportunities to be created for every American.

I know my friend agrees that getting our fiscal house in order, it is going to be critically important to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would say to my friend that frankly we're in a position where 75 times since 1962 we've increased the debt ceiling without focusing on the challenge of the debt itself.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you.

The answer to this problem is three things: jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I totally associate myself

with the remarks of my very good friend from New York and say that jobs, jobs, jobs continue to be our top priority. And I believe that this legislation before us is going to go a long way towards doing just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to 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. Mr. Speaker, I think that my friend from California, the chairman, my friend from New York, the chairman emeritus, have it exactly right. The issue is jobs. And that's really what this bill on the floor today is about.

One of the reasons, but for sure not the only reason, that our companies aren't hiring and our economy is not growing is uncertainty about interest rates. If you're thinking about adding on a new store or hiring more people to do more R&D and you think the interest rates are going to rise, you don't do it. If you're not sure what they're going to do, you don't do it. And we've been living under a period of uncertainty for two reasons with respect to interest rates.

The first is are we going to default on our national obligations? The House today will and should emphatically say no, we will not. And then the second question is will Uncle Sam continue to eat up too much of the entrepreneurial capital in this country to finance ever-growing Federal deficits?

The House today will and should, in my view, approve the bill before us that will begin to make a reduction in that deficit. This bill will reduce our projected deficit by anywhere from 25 to 35 percent. And it's important to understand what history tells us about sincere and legitimate deficit reduction.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton's plan was supposed to reduce the deficit by 28 percent. It did not. It reduced the deficit entirely. That bill was supposed to generate \$500 billion in deficit reduction. In fact, it generated \$1.6 trillion in deficit reduction. That's the elixir that the American economy needs now.

And I do not, my colleagues, believe that this is the only step that we need to accomplish in order to reduce unemployment. But it is an essential step. And for that reason, I am pleased to join with both Republicans and Democrats in voting "yes" for this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friend for his very thoughtful statement.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that if we look back on the juxtaposition of that projected \$500 billion in deficit reduction and the \$1.6 trillion that we attained, we know why it is that that came about. It was gross domestic product growth. And my friend and I have been working together for many years focused on how it is that we can get our economy growing.

In so doing, I believe as we continue to focus on that, that we will be able to see benefits beyond those anticipated today when it comes to deficit reduction if we're able to generate—unfortunately, we have had 1.3 percent GDP growth reported from the last quarter. If we can get to 3, 4, 5 percent GDP growth, my friend knows very well that we're going to be in a position where we will be able to see an even greater reduction of the deficits in years to come.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I agree with him, and I think that we owe it to the country to find common ground on economic growth.

The best deficit reduction plan is full employment. And the best full employment plan will be one that we could come together on. I think today is an important first step. It came too late, it was ugly getting here, but I'm glad we got here.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady, my good friend from New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the rules of the House. The Sergeant of Arms is to remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant of Arms will restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove the disturbance from the gallery.

□ 1520

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no idea that my pending remarks would lead to such a wellspring of apparent support.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the last rejoinder between the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California, spending cuts at this level are not going to create any jobs. The idea that spending cuts and deficit reduction will lead to unprecedented economic prosperity is absolutely a false economic premise. Getting control of our fiscal house to make sure that we make productive in-

vestments and create jobs will create jobs.

With respect to the proposal underlying this rule, Mr. Speaker, there's plenty for members of both parties to find objectionable, and they might be right, but the choice before us is not that between this proposal and some platonic ideal. It is between this proposal and catastrophic default tomorrow.

Unlike the cynical bill this Chamber passed on a party-line vote last week, this bill commits America to meeting its obligations for the longer term, it leaves all options on the table, including revenue for the bipartisan committee this fall to further reduce the deficit, and having triggers, painful for both parties, adds real accountability and strict enforcement.

The American people understand we need a balance to restore fiscal responsibility and grow our economy. Recent GDP and manufacturing numbers are painful reminders, Mr. Speaker, of the fragility of our economy and its recovery, and the actions of House Republicans, sadly, have only exacerbated that by pulling back on key investments in infrastructure and innovation.

It's time to end the reckless game of chicken being waged here in this House. I commend President Obama and other leadership for leading the adult conversation to bring about this compromise. It is now time for us to do the responsible thing and bring to heel the wolf at the door.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it is very interesting that as we have come together in a bipartisan way to address the crisis of increasing our debt ceiling, tackling the challenge of reducing the \$14.3 trillion national debt that we have, we had this disruption in the gallery.

Now I turned around, Mr. Speaker, and looked up there, and I will tell you—I don't know if you saw the placard that they were carrying—it had in great big letters across it, Create Jobs. Create Jobs is the message that they had. And, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we are doing, again working very diligently in a bipartisan way to ensure that we do just that.

With that, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, my good friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from California, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

I just did an interview with the TV station in my district. One of the questions that the interviewer asked is, "What does this mean to the average person in your district? People are paying attention to what's going on in D.C."

And I said, "That's probably the best thing that's happened out of this whole debate, that people are paying attention. Had they been paying attention

the last 40 years, we wouldn't be in the situation that we're in."

I then pointed out to her that in today's dollars, Federal spending per U.S. household went from \$11,431 in 1965 to \$29,401 in 2010. That tells us all that we need to know. The Federal Government is addicted to spending. We need to cut spending, not raise taxes, and this compromise bill does that.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from California said, we want to create jobs, and the best way to do that is to stop taking money out of the private sector, stop overtaxing the people in this country, leave that money in the private sector and allow it to be used to create jobs.

This is not a perfect bill. We all say it's not a perfect bill, both sides of the aisle. That generally means that it's a good bill because it's not perfect, and when people want compromise and they hear that, then they know that's right.

But the change in direction is historic. We're going from seeing how much money we can spend to how much can we cut. I am intrigued at a lot of my colleagues across the aisle, they've obviously been on the road to Damascus, because their whole language has changed in response to this bill, but I am glad they have finally seen the light and I hope in the future they're going to join us in more efforts like this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Tea Party for extorting a deal made in their image and their image alone. The cuts will be deep, they will be lasting, and they will weaken an already depressed economy. What's clear is that the Tea Party is so ideologically driven to kill government that they're willing to kill the private sector, kill jobs, and kill growth in the process.

What's more, these cuts will be loaded onto the backs of seniors and the American middle class, all while asking the wealthiest among us to sacrifice nothing. Once again, the rich will feel no pain and the vulnerable will pay for their spoils.

Mr. Speaker, the process in which we got here has undermined our democratic system. While Democrats and the President negotiated in good faith, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrated a craven willingness to risk financial collapse for their extreme demands. As Democrats conceded time after time and provision after provision on this deal, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just continued to issue new demands, all the while compromising nothing. Moreover, I am very concerned with the precedent set by this "super committee" whose establishment threatens our democratic process with its unconstitutional structure.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say if this bill passes, it may be the single

worst piece of public policy to ever come out of this institution. I cannot support this rule, and I urge my Democratic colleagues not to be complicit in a Republican plan to eventually cut Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid and investment in our future, all while asking the rich to sacrifice nothing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my fellow Angeleno that, while I've associated myself with the remarks of most of my other colleagues, I'm hard-pressed to associate myself with her remarks.

With that, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I was excited to come down here today, because when I ran for Congress, there was just a short list of things that I wanted to do when I got here. I'm one of the new guys, one of this crowd of 96 new freshmen.

Two things among those: Number one, folks back home said we're spending too much. \$1.091 trillion is how much we spent in discretionary spending in 2010. This bill that the Rules Committee brings to the floor today brings it down to \$1.043 trillion, a \$50 billion cut from 2 years ago, not decreasing the rate of growth but actually changing the trajectory of spending in this country. That's what folks back home said they wanted me to do.

Number two, I hold in my hand the United States Constitution. I turn to the back; conveniently enough in my edition, there's a little blank space after Amendment 27. There is space for Amendment 28, and for the first time in 15 years, this bill guarantees us a vote on a balanced budget amendment. If you don't trust your Members of Congress, trust your United States Constitution, and trust that this bill gives the American people a vote that they have not had in far too long.

□ 1530

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Collinsville, Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am not coming down here to blame one side or the other for the financial position that we are in because we all have a part to play in the story, but this is a great day. I was also asked earlier about how I felt about today, and I told them I felt relieved.

I was afraid of the credit markets. I was afraid of rising interest rates. Whatever recovery we are having, I was afraid that it could stem that tide. So I do feel a great relief. This is one of the few times, in the 103 times that we have actually cut spending, when we

tried in attempting to raise the debt limit. We can no longer continue to spend and borrow 42 cents of every dollar that we spend. It's ridiculous, and this is starting to change that process.

We are going to have discretionary cuts. We are going to have entitlement reforms.

I do like the supercommittee: bicameral, bipartisan, equally divided. When have we had a committee where we have equally divided the decision-making not upon majority and minority side, but equally divided, three Republicans, three Democrats in the House; three Republicans, three Democrats in the Senate? If this committee can't start addressing our entitlement reforms, then I am afraid we are never going to do it.

So I have great faith in my colleagues who will be put on this committee. We really have to make the great choices.

I appreciate the Rules Committee for bringing this to the floor, and my good friend, DAVID DREIER. And I hope that we will continue to move forward, pass the rule, and pass the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds to comment on the supercommittee.

When was the last time we had a bipartisan group like that? Simpson-Bowles, which got absolutely nowhere; the Gang of Six in the Senate, again which got absolutely nowhere. And six and six, I can imagine what it is going to be like to get somebody to be the seventh vote on the other side.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a great big difference between the commissions that have been established in the past and the fact that this is a congressional committee, for the first time made up of our colleagues from the House and the Senate.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right. These outside commissions that have been there have made recommendations and they have gone virtually nowhere.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If I may respond to the gentleman, I don't think the Gang of Six was any outside committee.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New York for yielding to me.

I rise today in opposition to the Budget Control Act amendment. Over the past months, I have been urging for a clean vote to raise the debt ceiling, a vote that has taken place 75 times since FDR was President, 18 times under Reagan, eight times under Bush. And I think that's what we should have done, and then put our heads together.

You see, I disagree with my friends on the other side of the aisle. It isn't just entitlement reform that we need;

although, we do need entitlement reform. It isn't just for government to spend less that we need; although, we do need government to spend less.

But what happened to fairness? Why are we asking this bill to balance our budget on the backs of the middle class and poor people? Why do we not have anything in this bill that makes millionaires and billionaires, who can afford to pay a little bit more, pay a little bit more? Why don't we close tax loopholes so that Big Oil and gas and other corporations pay their fair share? Why don't we do any of that whatsoever?

So this bill is unbalanced to begin with. Now we are talking about some supercommittee, even amounts of Democrats and Republicans, even amounts from the Senate and the House. To me, that's a recipe for gridlock. And I guarantee you, my colleagues, we're going to be here at that point after Thanksgiving when nothing is going to happen, and we are going to wind up with entitlement cuts that are going to hurt my seniors and your seniors with Medicare and graduate medical education in New York, which is so important. Hurt that, hurt the providers.

Who are we kidding? We're going to cut from the providers, the hospitals and think it's not going to impact on patient quality and patient care? What about the doc fix, when our doctors say, We're not taking Medicare patients anymore?

This bill, to me, is a pig in a poke, and I'm not willing to buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first yield myself 30 seconds.

I was engaging in a colloquy with my good friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking minority member, and I would be happy to yield to her in just a moment, Mr. Speaker. But back to this issue of this joint select committee that is going to be charged with coming up with \$1.5 trillion in proposed cuts, and their recommendations will be sent to both Houses of Congress for an up or down vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is unprecedented, because unlike the commissions that have been put together, the Bowles-Simpson Commission, unlike this little caucus of Senators that my friend just mentioned, this Gang of Six, there is no legislative authority or power.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

There is no legislative authority or power. This time this demonstrates that Members of the House and Senate will, in fact, come together and work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we bring about meaningful spending cuts to the tune of \$1.5 trillion. That's the difference that exists with this proposal that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question this isn't a perfect bill. There's a lot of things that I would have liked and I know that other Members on my side of the aisle would have liked. We would have liked deeper spending cuts. We would have certainly liked some entitlement reform in this. We would have preferred to mandate that this House and the other body take up a balanced budget amendment and give the people in the States an opportunity to render a decision on that. Those things aren't in this bill.

I know there's things that some of my friends on the other side wanted: higher taxes, no changes in entitlements. They didn't get everything they wanted either.

But this bill does adhere to the principles our Speaker laid out at the very beginning of the negotiations.

First, most importantly, and both sides agree on this, it avoids default. It avoids the United States not paying its obligations for the first time in 235 years. I am glad both sides cooperated and got that done.

Secondly, it actually cuts spending and links those spending cuts to the raising of the debt ceiling. There's more spending cuts than there is increased borrowing going forward. That's a good thing.

Third, no new taxes, something that would be a killer on the new economy.

And, finally, while we don't get a guarantee of a balanced budget amendment, we do get a guaranteed vote.

This is exactly what the American people have asked us to do: come together, compromise, work together on their behalf, and let them get about their business without creating additional problems for them.

With this bill, we put the American people first. We're going to continue to work on their problems. So I urge that we pass the rule and the underlying legislation.

I thank my friend for giving me the time to speak.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a challenging day. It's a difficult day, but it's a day that we're making a decision, a big decision, an important decision that the United States of America will not default on its obligations. This sends stability to the financial markets all around the world, and it really embellishes our stature as the gold standard. And that is very important.

It also gives us until 2013 for us to be able to revisit this again, as the President of the United States asked. And I think another important thing that it does is it helps us to hurry up and get this all-consuming issue of the debt and the deficit and the raising of the debt ceiling off the front burner so we can immediately put jobs back on the front burner.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we must focus our attention now on jobs. That's what the American people want us to do. On this Friday, we're going to have a jobs report. And I want us to carefully look at that jobs report, and especially look at that side of the jobs report that shows the number of jobs we're losing in the public sector.

□ 1540

So as we are here engaging, and some of my friends are celebrating, the whole issue of us cutting \$2.5 trillion out of our budget over the 10-year period, it is important to know that there is a cost for this, my friends, and that cost is a loss of public jobs.

So as we set this new commission up, this new committee, we have got to make sure that as these cuts go forward that we understand the sensitivity of trying to make these cuts away from putting more of our people on the jobless rolls. Right now, the greatest contribution that the Federal Government is making to jobs is putting more people out of jobs.

So I ask that we take time now, now that we are going to put this issue behind us, to focus like a laser beam on jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to one of our diligent new members of the freshman class, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I want to thank the distinguished chairman from San Dimas, California.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, our getting our fiscal house in order is one of the most important things that we can do in this body to jump-start our economy.

Just recently our economy has seen weak economic growth, especially over the last two quarters. Just today we find out that manufacturing is at its lowest level in the last 2 years. In my district, the 10th District of Illinois, we have one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country, and there is no doubt that families—not only in the 10th District, but across the land—are struggling.

Today I am optimistic that Washington is finally coming together in a bipartisan way to find some common ground on this debt ceiling debate. We must, we must move forward. Hard-working taxpayers have had enough, and I get it. We have spending discipline here in Washington, no more budget gimmicks, no more accounting tricks, no more empty promises. American families have had to tighten their belts all across the land. American businesses had to do the same. They should expect the Federal Government should follow suit. Now is the time to move forward and focus on jobs.

If we were serious about paying down our debt and increasing revenue, then we must empower job creators. Small businesses in our Nation are overburdened by economic uncertainty, government regulations, and redtape. We need to implement commonsense solutions and create jobs to get our economy moving again.

As a small business owner, Mr. Speaker, I employ just under 100 families, and for me that's an enormous responsibility. We have to move forward. We have to empower job creators. We have to talk about getting 9.2 percent unemployment down so that we can get our economy going and bring additional revenues into the Federal coffers by putting more people back to work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Budget and Ways and Means Committees.

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

Well, we are facing an artificial Republican debt crisis that was a crisis of choice, of their choice. Remember, we have repeatedly increased the debt ceiling for Republican and Democratic administrations and congresses year in and year out.

This proposal moving forward is very troubling on several levels. First, it empowers the most reckless and extreme elements, not just in the House Republican Caucus today, but it is a blueprint for mischief for either party in the future.

Next we are starting down a path of more budget cuts at a time when all the experts assure us this will weaken the economy, when, instead, we should be strengthening, dealing with economic growth, not reducing demand. It's all the more frustrating because there is a path going forward that is clear.

The public strongly supports a balanced approach, which should include tax reform that would raise money while make the Tax Code more fair and simple. Do we need a commission to implement suggestions, to right-size the military, both its mission and its budget? Absolutely not.

There are lots of ideas and support on both sides of the aisle that could be enacted to achieve this goal. But the magnitude of the trigger actually invites mischief. Again, when we have seen the Republican "take no prisoners" attitude, what leads anybody to believe they won't do it in this case?

Most important, we should be revitalizing the economy by rebuilding and renewing America, financed by modest increases in user fees. This has support all across the business community, labor, environment, local government, even some of my Republican friends, but they take this off the table.

And, last but not least, one of the most simple things we could do would be to implement agricultural reform to save money and help people who farm and people who eat, rather than lavish subsidies for large agribusiness. These are things that we should be doing. These are things that actually could have bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, this agreement, if it goes forward, will delay that important work of reform and fiscal responsibility while it weakens both the economy and the decisionmaking process

for years to come. Government on autopilot in a slow, downward spiral is not a victory in anybody's book.

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

I would say to my very good friend that I agree with some of the remarks that he made on doing things like eliminating agricultural subsidies. I would say to my friend from Oregon, who is still in the Chamber here and now walking off the floor, I would say to my friend that I agree with his remarks about the need for us to focus on agriculture subsidies and bringing about a reduction there.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

I would say that we are trying to work this out with a spirit of bipartisanship. My friend began his statement by saying that this was a crisis developed by Republican policies.

Since we are working in a bipartisan way, I think the notion that recognizing that an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years clearly played a role in getting us exactly where we are.

I yield 1½ minutes to another one of our hardworking new Members of Congress, the gentleman from Little Rock, Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, when I announced and wanted to run for Congress, my focus primarily was on the debt, on the issue of the debt and the impact that the debt was going to have on my daughter and my little boy. My daughter, Mary Katherine, is sitting with me right here today for this historic day. It's critically important to me. And a lot of the folks back home that I hear from, when they contact me, they contact me about the debt and about spending.

Now I came up here to do something about it, and I have been watching this debate closely, and I have been a supporter of the Speaker both on the plan last week, and I am a supporter of the agreement that is going to come before us today. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. Is it great? Absolutely not. Is it good? It's a good first step.

I would say this: If a President and a Senate that I agreed with put this type of plan forward, I would reject it out of hand.

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

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If a deal, an agreement like this, came from a President with which I generally agree, and a Senate with which I generally agreed, I would reject it out of hand. But that's not what we have. We have divided government. We have this Chamber controlled by a different vision for America.

So I believe this is about as good as we are going to get, and I am supporting it because it is consistent with

my principles. There are no tax increases. It controls spending now, controls spending in the future, and allows us to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

These are all things that I can support. These are the principles that we have been fighting for over the last few months. And I would say this: If this were the only step ever in dealing with the debt, I would vote "no," but it's not.

□ 1550

It's only the beginning. We didn't get in this mess with one bill or one piece of legislation. It took a long time and a lot of votes, and it's going to take a long time and a lot of battles to get out of it. And this is a good first step.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to guests on the floor of the House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. At this point I'm very happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my good friend from St. Joseph, Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I appreciate the minute.

My constituents are saying get the job done. Vote for the rule and vote for the bill. The President said about a year ago, I want to say it was the State of the Union Address, the debt today is unsustainable. He's right. And for the first time, we are coupling an increase in the debt ceiling with real reductions in spending. No, this is not reducing the rate of growth in spending. This is actually reducing spending. In fact, at the end of the day, when we look at fiscal year 2012 versus fiscal year 2011, we are going to be spending less money in 2012 than we did in the 2011.

Nobody—nobody—is coming to our offices and saying cut our spending. But, in fact, the American public is saying, Federal Government, cut your spending. That's what this bill will do. It's going to reduce spending. Yes, it's going to increase the ceiling on the debt, but it's coupled with real reforms that I think the American public want, and that's why it's going to have some bipartisan support when we deal with this issue a little bit later on this afternoon.

So I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle. Let's get the job done. Let's get it over with so we can get to the business of running the rest of the government and the country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another one of our thoughtful new Members, the gentleman from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for the opportunity to address the Chamber this morning.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this bill, a bill that will address the

terrible uncertainty that has been taking place over the course of these last few weeks—the seniors, the taxpayers, the small business people who have been speaking to me as I have been making the phone calls and talked with them about the concerns that they have in this era of uncertainty.

I've heard commentary that this is identified as a crisis caused by Republicans when, in fact, the crisis has been the business as usual which has been taking place in Washington, D.C. This is finally a time in which we looked at the issues that are before us and made the tough decisions to address the long-term unsustainability of this debt; \$14.2 trillion in debt is going to be facing the next generation. I note that there are arguments that somehow it was policies of Big Oil and health care, the things that have been Republican policies when, in fact, if you look just at the beginnings of this administration, there was the commitment to Medicare, there were the subsidies to Big Oil, we were in with the subsidies, not just to Big Oil, but also involved in two wars and the debt was \$162 billion. Now it's 1.2 trillion.

We must take these kinds of steps and work together. This is a solution that will allow a genuine bipartisan opportunity to address this for the future generations, create predictability, and allow us to get back to creating jobs. I urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the era of debts and deficits must come to an end. However, in addressing this problem, we must look at what got us here. It wasn't overspending on low-income housing, job training or education—which all stand at historically low levels. It was two unfunded wars and the Bush tax cuts which keep on giving to America's wealthiest.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us today keeps every tax break for the wealthy and means billions more in resources will be used to fund these two wars.

We keep hearing how critical this bill is to getting our economy back on track. It is hard to imagine how this legislation will do so. I cannot support any proposal with such big cuts in education, economic development and job training that will hamper our recovery. In the weeks leading up to today there was a lot of rhetoric for shared sacrifice. Unfortunately, what we are considering today places the burden of the fiscal mess squarely on our Nation's working families, and that is something I cannot support.

I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and vote “no” on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that your superb presiding over this House is only exceeded by the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long road and one with more uncertainty than the American people should have to put up with. Fortunately, the ugly part of the process is behind us, and it's time to come together behind a realistic deal that will restore strength to the economy and deliver peace of mind to the American public.

I believe that this is that deal. It's not perfect, but with a majority in just one Chamber, House Republicans negotiated a compromise that will be part of the debt solution, not part of the debt problem. It will stop a job-killing default, but cut spending even more. And it will hold Congress and the President accountable with automatic spending cuts and a guaranteed vote on the balanced budget amendment. Most importantly, it doesn't raise taxes—something that would damage our recovery.

We have changed the conversation. The President is no longer asking for a blank check; he is negotiating with us to cut spending. This is how we'll end this spiral of debt that is draining our economy of capital, competence and jobs.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have contributed to this discussion, and I urge them to support this bipartisan deal. Let's get the job done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Clinton Township, New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman DREIER, for your leadership on this extremely important issue.

I rise in support of the rule, and I rise in support of the underlying legislation which is, by its nature, bipartisan, bicameral and a compromise that avoids default, adds certainty to our economic recovery, and puts our Nation on a sustainable path towards fiscal responsibility. What we need in America is jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, and this will help that effort forward.

This support is consistent with my longstanding efforts to bring fiscal sanity to New Jersey and to be among those attempting to bring it here to Washington. The main portions of the compromise have been outlined, but for the first time the narrative on Capitol Hill is no longer how much can government spend, but how we can best reduce spending. This new awakening to fiscal prudence is in the best interests of the Nation and, indeed, I believe is the critical issue of our generation.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER for his superb leadership on this issue, and I shall vote for the rule and the underlying legislation in the belief that it will help move our Nation forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we should never have found ourselves where we are today, facing a self-inflicted crisis and being asked to vote for a bill that has so many flaws. The prolonged debate that led us here has caused the world to question our Nation's credibility and already inflicted harm on the U.S. economy.

□ 1600

The irony of our situation is the other side claims to be bringing certainty to the market, but the reality is they have undermined faith in the United States Government's ability to lead the global economy. Throughout this debate, Congress has gotten lost in the crisis created instead of the true crisis of unemployment that faces our constituents. Nobody, even Members of Congress, especially Members of Congress, should have the ability to bring the faith in the American Government to its knees.

It's high time we address the crisis of jobs in our country and resolve the self-inflicted crisis we are facing today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, 224 years ago this summer, the framers of our Constitution were in Philadelphia at Constitution Hall, and they were working very hard to put together what ended up being this inspired document authored by James Madison.

On July 16, 1787, they actually completed a compromise. It was known as the Connecticut Compromise. The Connecticut Compromise is what established a bicameral legislature—two Houses of Congress. That Connecticut Compromise was also called the Great Compromise.

I know that the word “compromise” is seen as a pejorative in the eyes of many, but what we have before us is a compromise. It hasn't been easy getting here. When James Madison was asked often about the first branch of government, putting together the process of lawmaking, he said that the process of lawmaking is an ugly, messy, difficult process. Over the last several months, we've seen, as we have been pursuing this day, we've seen an ugly, messy, difficult process.

I am reminded that a couple of summers ago, I was talking with this amazing woman, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. She is the first woman to ever be President of any country on the continent of Africa. She is the President of Liberia. And we were talking about the development of the parliament in Liberia through this great commission called the House Democracy Partnership that

Mr. PRICE and I are privileged to lead. When we talked about the ugly, messy, difficult process of lawmaking, the President looked to me and she said: Ah, DAVID, you've forgotten one thing. Yes, it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, but it works.

So while we have so much time and energy and effort expended on partisan bickering, at the end of the day, this for me is a much, much more enjoyable time, when we are able to come together, tackling the serious problems that we as a Nation face and for the first time ever taking this issue of increasing the debt ceiling and actually dealing with the root cause of it.

I like to say that we don't have a debt ceiling problem; we have a debt problem. We have a \$14.3 trillion national debt. We all know that, fingers pointed from both sides of the aisle at the other on a regular basis.

Yet today, today is a time for us to recognize that we have come together to deal with it. And, for the first time in that 75 times since 1962 that the debt ceiling has increased, we're actually going to, with the establishment of this joint select committee, see our colleagues, in a bipartisan way, from the House and Senate come together and recommend \$1.5 trillion in proposed cuts. And there are mechanisms put into place, sequestration, which will actually force across-the-board cuts if they don't come up with recommendations.

So we are looking at a very, very good proposal that will help us do that. We are increasing the debt ceiling to pay our past obligations. I don't like the fact that we went through an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years. Even though I voted against almost all of it, I have to say, those bills have to be paid. And that's why it is we're increasing our debt ceiling.

I want to join in extending congratulations to all those who have been involved in this process in a bipartisan way.

So I will say again, it has, over the past several months, been an ugly, messy, difficult process. But with the vote that we are about to have on this rule—and I look forward to working on the underlying legislation itself, and I'm convinced we will have a strong bipartisan vote for it—we will prove, as President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf reminded me, even though it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, it works.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. DREIER. Mr. 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-vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 384, if ordered; and a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—242

Adams	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Akin	Gowdy	Paul
Alexander	Granger	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Austria	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Platts
Bartlett	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Pompeo
Bass (NH)	Hall	Posey
Benishek	Hanna	Price (GA)
Berg	Harper	Quayle
Biggart	Harris	Quigley
Bilbray	Hartzler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth	Reichert
Black	Heck	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Bonner	Herger	Rigell
Bono Mack	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Boustany	Huelskamp	Roby
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	Ryunan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carney	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	Shuler
Crenshaw	Latta	Shuster
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Denham	Long	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stearns
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dreier	E.	Stutzman
Duffy	Mack	Sullivan
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Terry
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	Marino	Thornberry
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Eshoo	McCaul	Tipton
Farenthold	McClintock	Turner
Fincher	McCotter	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Walberg
Flake	McKeon	Walden
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McMorris	Webster
Flores	Rodgers	West
Forbes	Meehan	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Mica	Whitfield
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gallegly	Mulvaney	Womack
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Garrett	Myrick	Yoder
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Noem	Young (FL)
Gibson	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	
Gohmert	Nunnelee	

NAYS—184

Ackerman	Green, Al	Pallone
Altire	Grijalva	Pascarell
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Hahn	Payne
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Berkley	Heinrich	Peters
Berman	Higgins	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Polis
Blumenauer	Hirono	Price (NC)
Boren	Hochul	Rahall
Boswell	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Capps	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	(TX)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Kaptur	T.
Chu	Keating	Sánchez, Loretta
Ciilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Schiff
Clay	Kucinich	Schrader
Cleaver	Langevin	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Conyers	Levin	Sewell
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Costa	Lipinski	Sires
Costello	Loeback	Slaughter
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Critz	Lowey	Speier
Crowley	Lujan	Stark
Cultgren	Lynch	Sutton
Cummings	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Tierney
DeFazio	Matsui	Tonko
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeLauro	McCollum	Tsongas
Deutch	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dicks	McGovern	Velázquez
Dingell	McIntyre	Vislosky
Doggett	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Wasserman
Doyle	Michaud	Schultz
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Waters
Ellison	Miller, George	Watt
Engel	Moore	Waxman
Farr	Moran	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Nadler	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Wu
Fudge	Neal	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Olver	
Gonzalez	Owens	

NOT VOTING—6

Andrews	Cantor	Green, Gene
Baca	Giffords	Hinchev

□ 1632

Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FORTENBERRY and KINGSTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. 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 249, nays 178, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 687]

YEAS—249

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

NAYS—178

Ackerman Blumenauer Carney  
 Altmire Boswell Carson (IN)  
 Baldwin Brady (PA) Castor (FL)  
 Barrow Braley (IA) Chandler  
 Bass (CA) Brown (FL) Chu  
 Becerra Butterfield Cicilline  
 Berkley Capps Clarke (MI)  
 Berman Capuano Clarke (NY)  
 Bishop (GA) Cardoza Clay  
 Bishop (NY) Carnahan Cleaver

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

NOT VOTING—5

Baca Giffords Hinchey  
 Boren Green, Gene

□ 1648

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 JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant  
 to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfin-  
 ished business is the question on agree-  
 ing to the Speaker's approval of the  
 Journal, which the Chair will put de  
 novo.

The question is on the Speaker's ap-  
 proval of the Journal.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. 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 de-  
 vice, and there were—yeas 304, nays  
 115, answered “present” 1, not voting  
 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 688]

YEAS—304

Ackerman Alexander Barletta  
 Aderholt Austria Barrow  
 Akin Bachus Bartlett

Barton (TX) Green, Al Owens  
 Bass (NH) Griffin (AR) Palazzo  
 Becerra Griffith (VA) Paul  
 Benishek Guinta Paulsen  
 Berg Guthrie Payne  
 Berkley Hahn Pelosi  
 Berman Hall Pence  
 Biggart Hanabusa Perlmutter  
 Bilbray Harper Petri  
 Bilirakis Hartzler Pingree (ME)  
 Bishop (GA) Hastings (WA) Platts  
 Bishop (UT) Hayworth Polis  
 Black Heinrich Pompeo  
 Blackburn Hensarling Posey  
 Blumentauer Herger Price (GA)  
 Bonner Higgins Quayle  
 Bono Mack Hinojosa Quigley  
 Boren Hirono Rangel  
 Boustany Hochul Reed  
 Braley (IA) Holden Reberg  
 Brooks Huelskamp Reichert  
 Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI) Reyes  
 Brown (FL) Hultgren Ribble  
 Buchanan Hunter Richardson  
 Bucshon Hurst Richmond  
 Buerkle Inslee Rigell  
 Burton (IN) Israel Rivera  
 Butterfield Issa Roby  
 Calvert Jenkins Roe (TN)  
 Camp Johnson (GA) Rogers (AL)  
 Campbell Johnson (IL) Rogers (KY)  
 Canseco Johnson, E. B. Rogers (MI)  
 Cantor Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher  
 Capito Jordan Rokita  
 Capps Kaptur Rooney  
 Carnahan Keating Ros-Lehtinen  
 Carney Kelly Roskam  
 Carter King (IA) Ross (AR)  
 Cassidy King (NY) Ross (FL)  
 Chabot King (NY) Rothman (NJ)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Roybal-Allard  
 Chabot King (NY) Royce  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Runyan  
 Chabot King (IA) Ruppelberger  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Rush  
 Chabot King (IA) Ryan (WI)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Scalise  
 Chabot King (IA) Schilling  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Schmidt  
 Chabot King (IA) Schock  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Schweikert  
 Chabot King (IA) Scott (SC)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Scott, Austin  
 Chabot King (IA) Sensenbrenner  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Sessions  
 Chabot King (IA) Shimkus  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Shuler  
 Chabot King (IA) Shuster  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Simpson  
 Chabot King (IA) Smith (NE)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Smith (NJ)  
 Chabot King (IA) Smith (TX)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Smith (WA)  
 Chabot King (IA) Southerland  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Speier  
 Chabot King (IA) Stark  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Stearns  
 Chabot King (IA) Stutzman  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Sullivan  
 Chabot King (IA) Terry  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Thompson (PA)  
 Chabot King (IA) Thornberry  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Tiberi  
 Chabot King (IA) Tipton  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Turner  
 Chabot King (IA) Upton  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Walberg  
 Chabot King (IA) Walden  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Walsh (IL)  
 Chabot King (IA) Webster  
 Chaffetz King (NY) West  
 Chabot King (IA) Westmoreland  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Whitfield  
 Chabot King (IA) Wilson (SC)  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Wittman  
 Chabot King (IA) Wolf  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Womack