United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2010 *No. 17*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 4, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In thanks and gratitude we breathe the life-giving spirit of a new day, a day filled with creative potential and possibility.

As on the first day, may this day be ''in the beginning.'' May we see the goodness and abundance of creation. May we embrace the name given to us, Human—from the Earth. May we look into the eternal waters and see in our own reflections the image of the name that cannot be named, the eternal living presence we call by many names. May we see both the human and the divine in ourselves and every other person. May we see the eternal presence of life in all creation.

May the light of the first day be our guiding vision for every day, particularly within the deliberations and decisions among the minds, spirits, and imagination of these Chambers, leading us to see and respect the sacred dignity and worth of everyone and everything, everywhere.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas 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.

AIG BONUSES

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment and dismay with AIG's decision to pay $100 million in bonuses to executives. These are not just any employees but those from the financial products division, the same group that created the flimsy derivatives that caused such a catastrophe for our economy in late 2008.

With taxpayer dollars allowing to keep AIG afloat and ordinary Americans facing 10 percent unemployment, I don't know who would have thought this announcement would be well-received by the American people. It may be that these bonuses were legally obligated before the AIG crash, but I'm sure that all the brainpower that created AIG's complicated financial products can figure out a way, as the American people would, to simply say ''no.''

CONGRATULATING THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY FIRE RESCUE URBAN SEARCH AND RESCUE TEAM FOR THEIR EFFORTS IN HAITI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. My sincerest thanks and congratulations to the Miami-Dade County Fire Rescue Urban Search and Rescue team for their heroic efforts in aiding the relief work in Haiti. Their courage and dedication to helping save lives are examples for us all. Under the leadership of Division Chief Dave Downey, an 80-man team was sent to Haiti 1 day after it was ravaged by a magnitude 7.0 earthquake.

I would like to commend Miami-Dade Fire Rescue, under the direction of Fire Chief Herminio Lorenzo, for their courageous commitment and dedication to saving lives in south Florida and worldwide. As a result of their work in Haiti, lives have been saved and many more individuals have been aided.

Their selfless dedication and sense of mission are testaments to our Nation's highest principle. The team's experience in disaster relief efforts during Hurricane Katrina, in the aftermath of 9/11, and the 1999 earthquake in Turkey, as part of the national Urban Search and Rescue Response System, were invaluable to their rescue efforts in Haiti. Congratulations to all.

☐ 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.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. ARCURI. Last week I joined with several of my colleagues in the Blue Dog and Populist Caucuses to call for a budget plan that is fiscally responsible. As I have said before, along with the President, if the American family has been tasked with tightening its belt, in this time of economic recovery, then so should Congress.

Pay-as-you-go legislation is on the floor today, and I have never been more optimistic about this key piece of legislation being passed and Congress returning to a time where a balanced budget was the goal, not outrageous deficit spending like that which was done under the previous administration.

I have also promised to work with the members of the Populist Caucus to ensure that big banks and Wall Street firms are held accountable for damage they have done to hardworking American families. If it is the fault of these huge banks and firms that we are in this situation, then they should pay to get us out of it.

I am proud to join with both the Blue Dog and Populist Caucuses in promoting fiscal responsibility and a new, responsible way forward for this country's economic future.

DIGGING THE DEEP HOLE OF DEBT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today we are voting on whether or not to raise the debt limit so the government can borrow more money. Borrowing and spending is out of control.

This is one of my kid's old credit cards. When it reached the spending limit, it meant there was no more room on the credit card for one of my four kids to spend more money. So when it reached the limit, they begged Daddy to raise the limit so they could spend more money. And if I raised the limit, spending always increased until that new limit was reached.

Today we're voting on whether or not to add $1.9 trillion more to the national credit card limit. So what happens if we say ''no'' to all the borrowing? We might have to quit spending money. Do the American people really want their government spending and borrowing less money? I think they do.

This is my congressional voting card. I will be using this card to vote against more debt on the American people. When you find yourself in a financial hole, stop digging.

Don't borrow more money and buy a backhoe and dig a deeper hole of debt.

And that's just the way it is.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN JOHNNY

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, on behalf of Yucca Mountain Johnny and the people of the State of Nevada, I want to thank the President for putting the kibosh on the Yucca Mountain project, which would have shipped 77,000 tons of toxic nuclear radioactive waste across 43 States to be buried in a hole in the Nevada desert, where we have groundwater problems, seismic activity, volcanic activity, no radiation standards, no way to safely transport the waste, and no canister that currently exists that could store the waste without corroding.

The President came to Nevada 20 times during the campaign and pledged to stop Yucca Mountain. This week, he honored his pledge. The people of the State of Nevada are grateful that he ended this expensive, dangerous, foolish project.

On behalf of Yucca Mountain Johnny, and myself, we thank you, Mr. President. Way to go.

CASH FOR COURTROOMS

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Remember September 11, 2001? Two planes hit the World Trade Center. One plane crashed into the Pentagon and another was stopped from hitting its targets in Washington by the brave action of its passengers. All together, thousands died—civilians and soldiers—in that terrorist attack of war.

Now, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the self-professed mastermind of this act, and his four co-conspirators are to be tried for this act. But the administration wants to take them out of the detention facility at the Navy base Guantanamo and try them in a civilian court, not a military court. To sweeten the deal, the administration is offering $200 million in a cash for courtrooms deal.

No amount of Federal funds can compensate for the risk this trial would place on the people of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, or any other State that would seem to have jurisdiction. This unnecessarily jeopardizes the safety of the citizens, the jurors, and the judges in those communities.

Mohammed and his coconspirators should be tried not in a civilian court for the terrorist acts of war. The American people get it. They want them to be judged by a military court. Why doesn't Washington get it, too?

POPULIST CAUCUS BLUEPRINT ON RECOVERY

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a founding member of the Populist Caucus to urge my colleagues to support the plan to create jobs and rein in Wall Street. We must end these big corporate bonuses to executives at financial firms that were bailed out by the taxpayers.

Just yesterday, it was reported that AIG is spending another $100 million in bonuses. The people who helped to get us into this mess should not be rewarded while their companies still owe money to the American people.

That is why the Populist Caucus is supporting H.R. 4426, the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act. This bill would tax the bonuses of the bailed-out companies to help small businesses by providing direct lending and other financial assistance.

In addition, the Populist Caucus is supporting H.R. 4191, the Let Wall Street Pay for Restoration of Main Street Act. This bill would create a small transaction fee on certain trades—not the small trades of individual investors or retirement accounts—and it would use those funds to support job creation and to pay down the debt.

Madam Speaker, Wall Street has gone right back to their old ways, but small businesses and families are still suffering. Wall Street must now help small businesses and workers. These bills would help, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Economist Magazine had an article in which they said it was time for the President to get tough, and in it, it pointed to the fact that he needed to be serious about the trade issue. It congratulated him for not taking a step backward toward protectionism. But the fact of the matter is, by doing nothing, we are taking a step backward.

Now I'm glad to see that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Locke, is today launching an initiative which will encourage greater trade. Well, it's wonderful to say that we need to focus on a small business, 21st century, export-oriented trade policy, but the fact is the only way that we can do that is if we pry open new markets for union and nonunion workers in the United States of America at companies like Caterpillar, Whirlpool, and other companies. We can do that by doing what the President failed to do in his State of the Union message after making a great statement about trade, and that is: send up the agreements that are pending that have been signed for Panama, Colombia, and South Korea. The votes are here if we could have that on the floor of the House ASAP so that we create good American jobs.

□ 1015

REINSTATING FISCAL DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, working families and small businesses across New Mexico face difficult budgeting decisions. And when it comes to the Federal budget, we owe it to them to spend within our means and without unreasonable borrowing. This legislation, referred to as PAYGO, mandates that the Federal Government pay for new tax cuts and spending by finding savings elsewhere.

In the 1990s, PAYGO helped turn massive deficits into record surpluses, but that policy was abandoned by the Bush administration. After not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and a new entitlement program, we now face a growing deficit. I am an original cosponsor of PAYGO legislation because we have to get this deficit under control. For the sake of our children and for our financial future, we must reinstate fiscal discipline in Washington.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President's $3.8 trillion budget proposal sets a lot of new records—record spending, record deficits, record debt. We can't tax, spend, borrow, and bail out our way to recovery. If we could, we wouldn't have 10 percent unemployment after passing a multibillion-dollar stimulus package and raising the debt limit to $14.3 trillion. That's $47,000 for each American.

Americans are sick and tired of the Democrats' tax-and-spend agenda. Unfortunately, this President's budget only proposes more of the same. It's time for a new approach to fixing our economy. Let's focus on balancing the budget and lowering taxes for small businesses. That's the way to grow the economy and finally create jobs. Congress should never vote for anything less.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Pursuant to House Resolution 1051 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4061.

□ 1017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, with Ms. BALDWIN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, February 3, 2010, amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 111–410, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 19 by Mrs. HALVORSON of Illinois;

Amendment No. 20 by Ms. KILROY of Ohio;

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. KISSELL of North Carolina;

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. OWENS of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. HALVORSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mrs. HALVORSON:

Page 15, line 2, strike "need and to" and insert "need, to".

Page 15, line 5, insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) ", and to veterans. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "veteran" means a person who—

(A) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than 180 consecutive days, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; or

(B) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability before serving 180 consecutive days.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term "service-connected" has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—424

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell

Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Barrett (SC)
Boozman
Brown, Corrine
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Murtha
Platts
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1049

Messrs. STEARNS and SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. KILROY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Ms. KILROY:

Page 14, line 10, strike ''and''.

Page 14, line 12, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 14, after line 12, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) outreach to secondary schools and 2-year institutions to increase the interest and recruitment of students into cybersecurity-related fields.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

AYES—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—4

Broun (GA)
Flake
McClintock
Paul

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Cantor
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Engel
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Johnson, E. B.
Murtha
Platts
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1058

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 40, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. KISSELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. KISSELL:

Page 11, lines 9 and 10, strike ''Section 5(a)(6) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:'' and insert ''Section 5(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting '', including curriculum on the principles and

techniques of designing secure software'' after ''network security''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 6, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

AYES—423

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—6

Broun (GA)
Campbell
Flake
Lewis (CA)
McClintock
Paul

NOT VOTING—10

Barrett (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Ellsworth
Engel
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Murtha
Radanovich
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1106

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 6, line 24, insert '', including technologies to secure sensitive information shared among Federal agencies'' after ''digital infrastructure''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 430, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

AYES—430

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Cassidy
Engel
Gutierrez
Murtha
Radanovich
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1115

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Ms. BALDWIN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1051, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. 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 422, nays 5, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—5

Broun (GA)
Flake
Gohmert
Paul
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—6

Barrett (SC)	Murtha	Thompson (PA)
Gutierrez	Radanovich	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1135

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 4061, CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 4061, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 45, INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1065 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1065

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the Majority Leader or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between concurring in the matter preceding title I of the Senate amendment and concurring in the matter comprising titles I and II of the Senate amendment. The first portion of the divided question shall be considered as adopted. If the second portion of the divided question fails of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1065.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 45, the debt limit and statutory PAYGO resolution. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the majority leader or a designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the motion except those arising under clause 10 of House rule XXI and provides 1 hour of debate on the motion. The rule divides the question between concurring in the matter preceding title I of the Senate amendment and concurring in titles I and II of the amendment. The first portion of the question shall be considered as adopted. If the second portion fails, then the House will be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment.

Madam Speaker, this vote is both historic and difficult. It is historic because it is reinstating the pay-as-you-go law, or PAYGO. This is one tool in the effort to reduce the deficit and return fiscal common sense back to our budget. And it is difficult because this resolution includes a $1.9 trillion increase in the debt limit.

Now, let me begin with the debt limit. None of us are eager to increase the debt limit. But we have a responsibility to take action. The Treasury Department has informed Congress that the United States will reach the current statutory limit on the national debt on February 11. That is next Thursday. If the debt limit is not increased before that date, Treasury will not be able to meet the obligations of the U.S. Government.

Simply, Madam Speaker, if we don't act, then we will default. Now, I can't think of a more reckless or irresponsible act. Defaulting is not an option. If the United States defaults, investors will lose confidence that the U.S. will honor its debts in the future. They would likely demand higher interest rates to compensate for the higher risk of purchasing Treasury securities. And this would increase the cost of Federal borrowing, result in even greater budget deficits, and require higher taxes and fewer government services. A greater portion of U.S. wealth would be transferred to overseas creditors, to China, India, and Saudi Arabia. And it is also possible that those creditors would demand that the U.S. borrow in other currencies rather than dollars, putting in peril the very value and stability of the American dollar.

It is clear that the responsible course of action is to raise the debt limit. It is also clear that we are in this position because of the policies that have been implemented over the past decade. Ten years ago, Madam Speaker, we had a budget surplus. Since then, our country was attacked and the worst recession in our lifetimes took a severe economic toll on our Nation's economy. But we also had two wars that were unpaid for, tax cuts, mostly for the wealthy, that were unpaid for, and a prescription drug benefit that was unpaid for. Yes, Republicans and Democrats have had to increase the debt limit because of these policies and events. And unfortunately, we have to do it again today.

Now, I know there will be those who want to use this vote as a way to demagogue this issue. There will be those on my side of the aisle who will detail how the policies of the last 8 years put us in this position, and there will be those who use this debate to claim that the recession is the fault of the Democrats. We can have that debate, and we will have that debate. But at the end of the day, Madam Speaker, it is my hope that nobody in this Chamber would put our Nation at such financial and economic risk simply because of politics.

My friend from Massachusetts and my colleague, Congressman RICHARD NEAL, said it best in the Rules Committee last night: ''If you voted to go to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, if you voted for the tax cuts that went mostly to the wealthiest in this country, or if you voted for the Recovery Act, then you have to vote to raise the debt ceiling.'' Simply put, the American people want us to solve our Nation's problems. And increasing the debt limit is the responsible action. But it doesn't address the underlying problem. And that is the problem of the deficit.

That is where statutory PAYGO comes in. Statutory PAYGO requires all new policies be offset. That means paid for. In plain English, we have to pay for what we buy. While it is not the only step we can take, this is a solid step towards fiscal discipline.

Now, why is PAYGO so important? It is important because our fiscal health and long-term economic prosperity depend upon it. We must find a balance between short-term deficit spending to speed along our economic recovery with longer-term fiscal discipline.

Dick Cheney, Madam Speaker, famously said that deficits don't matter. Well, I believe that they do matter, and I am glad to hear that my Republican friends now agree with Democrats that deficits do matter. I trust that at the end of the day they will vote that way too. But whether you vote for this resolution or not, you must at least admit that President Obama and the Democrats are facing this problem head-on. We are making sure we responsibly meet our financial obligations. We are instituting PAYGO so that we pay for the programs that we are funding. And we expect President Obama to formalize a debt commission soon to make other recommendations to bring down our debt. These are important steps, and these are real steps.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, to vote for this rule and this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, no surprise, I rise in opposition to this closed rule. The charade of Speaker PELOSI running ''the most open, honest, and ethical Congress'' is once again confirmed today that that's not happening. That is not happening here again on the floor, and it's related to this activity that we went through in the Rules Committee upstairs just yesterday.

At a time of record deficits and record unemployment, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply trying to blame Republicans and George Bush rather than looking at their own responsibility of what they have done in the last year that has placed enormous, enormous financial strain on this country. Never once did they talk about that responsibility, that they led this country, saying, We must go and spend this money because it will lend itself to jobs. And we're going to have the stimulus bill. We're going to call it the stimulus bill.

The President went all over the country and Members of Congress went all over the country and sold this. It didn't work it. It didn't work. It didn't work big time. I didn't hear any offer of, Whoops. As Vice President BIDEN said, We guessed and it didn't work.

I think it would have been appropriate this morning for the gentleman from Massachusetts or anybody from the Democratic Party to stand up and say, You know, we did guess. I know those Republicans told us this wouldn't work, but we really guessed and we guessed wrong. The Vice President has the guts to say that. I think this body should say the same thing, rather than trying to blame this on George Bush.

Today, we're here to raise the debt limit an additional $1.9 trillion. Now, the first question is: My gosh, why so much? Because so much burden and debt has been added. The bottom line is we're only here because what our friends Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic Party have done did not work. They took out a monster loan that is not paying off. But today, there is not even a vote. It's required, but not even a vote or a debate on the issue of raising the debt limit. In fact, the majority party has used deceitful procedural games to hide the fact that they are raising the debt limit again, for the sixth time, six times since they took control of the House. Why, you ask? Well, it's to give their members political coverage and a vote on statutory PAYGO again. I guess we're going to keep blaming George Bush, President Bush, for this.

The bottom line is, Madam Speaker, as I speak to each of the Members here on the floor today, this is about raising the statutory debt limit $1.9 trillion. And my colleagues and I are going to spend the time today discussing the current economic climate, the reason why things aren't working. The majority's principles and priorities of spending and taxing and borrowing and the President's fiscal year 2011 budget—$3.6 trillion—that was just released this week tell the reason why.

Madam Speaker, we've told you over and over again, if you take the investor out of the equation, if you tax the American people, if you destroy job creators, if you go at employers and have a battle with them, they will get it. They will quit employing people.

Our President seems to have, every time I watch him, he's always after somebody. He's always got a problem; the bankers, the doctors, insurance. Every time I look up, our great President, Barack Obama, has an ax to grind with somebody, and it's generally employers. And then he wants to turn around and say, How come we don't have any jobs? Oh, we're going to get those. We'll get those. This is America. We can do anything.

But the policies are not creating jobs; they're creating debts. They're creating circumstances where this country has to again today borrow for the debt limit and pass a bill here today that says we're going to raise the debt limit $1.9 trillion so our government doesn't go belly up. Madam Speaker, that is over $46,000 per American family, just what we're doing now. Since September 2007, the year our friends the Democrats took control, over $3.8 billion, on average, has been added to the national debt every single day.

The President's budget borrows too much, taxes too much, and spends too much. But what it does is it kills the goose that lays the golden egg. Then we wonder why we don't have jobs in this country.

The $3.6 trillion budget represents nearly a 30-percent increase in total outlays since 2008. The budget includes more than $2 trillion in job-killing tax hikes, with nearly a 20-percent jump in the first year alone. I get it. I get it as an individual taxpayer, and that's why I virtually sold all my stock. I got out of the stock market because this administration and this Congress want to kill economic growth and opportunity, and I can't take that and everybody else can't take that. And so that's why you're seeing employers and others say, Enough is enough. That's what we're saying here today.

This tax includes taxes on small businesses, investors, and families earning less than $250,000 a year, also. I thought we heard the President say that he was going to give everybody a tax cut. They keep talking about it. Boy, it's a great idea to float. Sure wish you'd deliver on that one. But let's also go to the high side. We need investors to be in the game, Madam Speaker. We need investors, and this bill taxes the stuffings out of them.

Additionally, the President's budget runs up a record budget deficit again. We're going to vote on it again. Democrats, Yea, we support the President. All these great priorities. The national debt is predicted to double once again over 5 years and triple by 2019, and that's a mistake. Interest alone would set the American taxpayer back roughly $6 trillion, just the interest over the next decade.

The American people want Congress, want Washington to rein in borrowing, taxing, and spending. They don't want more of it. They want Congress to stop talking about what they will do about helping jobs and to actually make the environment better. There's still an experiment going on out there, Madam Speaker, and people are not buying it because they are concerned about Washington and what they're going to do next. Taxing, spending, and borrowing is not a way to start this new year.

During last week's State of the Union, President Obama stated, Starting in 2011, we will prepare to freeze government spending for 3 years. Great. Great, Mr. President. That was Thursday night. I went upstairs just yesterday and I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee on H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity bill, the first bill right out of the bag, and I took the President up on that and said, Hey, I think we ought to have an amendment added to the bill, since the bill doesn't do it, that would have frozen spending just on two programs for 3 years. My amendment would have saved a paltry $47 million. That's all, just $47 million. I know it's not a lot. And you would not have believed the calls at me about how out of line I was and how this was the most important thing in the history of our country.

This body is not prepared to make tough decisions. This body is not prepared even to cut $47 million after we clapped for the President just the other day. This Democrat majority continues to pursue initiatives and policies that will lead to more unemployment and bigger and more deficits. This administration and the Democratic majority promised the American people they would aim for jobs and economic recovery, health care, cleaner energy, better education. That list goes on and on and on. And I will tell you what we've got for it: record deficits, record spending, and record unemployment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues are impressive. They're impressive in their ability to cover their tracks. They make a mess; they cover their tracks. They make a bigger mess; they cover their tracks. They drove this economy into a ditch. They're trying to cover their tracks. Well, that's fine for playing politics on the House floor, but the facts are a stubborn thing. The facts are that $4 trillion of Bush tax cuts were unpaid, $4 trillion: $700 billion for the Bush prescription drug bill, unpaid for; $3.5 trillion in mandatory revenue costs of the Bush economic collapse that we had to endure because of the lousy economy; record job losses in the Bush economy.

Now, the fact of the matter is that we are faced with difficult economic times, and I would like to think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would at least take some responsibility in helping to fix things. My colleague talks about the Recovery Act as if it meant nothing.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Recovery Act is already responsible for as many as 2.4 million jobs through the end of 2009. An analysis by the Council of Economic Advisers also found that the Recovery Act is responsible for about 2 million jobs, and that's not counting the jobs that were saved. In my home city of Worcester alone, 500 teachers and support staff would have been laid off without the Recovery Act; 22 cops would have been laid off and 17 firefighters. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say, Fire them. Fire the teachers. Fire the cops. Fire the firefighters. That's irresponsible.

So I also point out that former McCain advisor Mark Zandi said that the stimulus was key to the strong fourth quarter growth in the U.S. economy. We just heard the news from the Department of Commerce that the U.S. economy grew at 5.7 percent from October through December, a better than expected gain.

And this is what Mark Zandi, the Republican advisor, said: I think the stimulus was key to the fourth quarter. It was really critical to business fixed investment because there was a tax bonus depreciation in the stimulus that expired in December and juiced up fixed investment. And also, it was very critical to housing and residential investment because of the housing tax credit. And the decline in government spending would have been measurably greater without the money from the stimulus, because the stimulus was very, very important to the fourth quarter. That's a Republican advisor, McCain advisor, Mark Zandi.

Now, I would just say, Madam Speaker, that those of us who voted for the Recovery Act have a responsibility to vote "yes" on this rule. But I would also say that those who voted for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, wars that were not paid for, somehow it's okay to ask all of our men and women to sacrifice, but we do nothing. But those wars were not paid for. But if you voted for the Bush tax cuts, the $4 trillion that was unpaid for, at least have the responsibility to come to the floor and do the right thing.

So I would urge my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to vote for this rule and vote for PAYGO. During the Bush years, no one talked about the deficit except to say that it didn't matter. That was Dick Cheney and some of my other colleagues. It does matter. We need to get the deficit under control. We need to help grow this economy. Statutory PAYGO is one way to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by the way, I like this PAYGO thing that my friends, the Democrats, are pushing. But when it comes down to it, they waive PAYGO on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Chico, California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. Excessive debt helped bring about the current economic downturn, and the American people know it. Working families have to make difficult choices every day to balance their budgets, yet Congress still refuses to make the tough choices needed to balance the Federal budget.

The legislation before us authorizes the Federal Government to go $2 trillion deeper in debt. In place of real fiscal discipline, it offers a phony pay-as-you-go rule that is full of loopholes and exceptions and does nothing to tackle our government's long-term structural deficits. The good news is that we can take real action to start cutting the deficit today. At a time when our economy is hurting and Washington continues to pile debt on future generations, it's simple common sense to stand up and say enough is enough.

By defeating the previous question and voting "no," the House will have an opportunity to consider the End TARP Act, legislation I introduced along with Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. TIAHRT that would finally bring TARP to an end and immediately reduce the amount of money the government must borrow. A vote for this rule is a vote in favor of the status quo in Washington. The American people have spoken, and it's time the House acts to reduce unnecessary spending.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

The constituents that I listen to know that both parties are responsible for borrowing a lot of money. They know that we borrowed a significant amount of money in recent times. They also know that the minority party voted to borrow and increase the national debt by 70 percent during the term of the prior President. They know that this is the worst economic times we've had since the Great Depression. They don't know this by reading the newspaper. They know it by reading the balance in their checking account or reading the foreclosure notice that came in the mail yesterday or reading the want ads because they're looking for a job. They know this.

They know that us saying the Republicans did wrong and the Republicans saying we did wrong isn't going to fix their problems. So what they know is they want to hear us talk about what to do about this burgeoning problem of the national debt. Here is our answer: We first believe that the best way to reduce the debt and reduce the deficit is to get people back to work so that individuals and families are able to pay taxes and so that businesses are able to pay taxes off of their profits.

The best deficit- and debt-reduction program is full employment. We have nothing like full employment, nothing like it at all. We've lost huge numbers of jobs, and our plan to do something about it has been this: First, we believe that we should cut taxes for middle-class families so they have more money to spend. That's what we did last year, and the President proposes to do it again this year. Second, we believe that we should cut taxes for small businesses so they can reinvest in their businesses. That's what we voted for last year. We're prepared to do it again. We believe that we should put people back to work, rebuilding our roads and our bridges, rail systems, clean water systems, clean energy. That's what we voted to do last year.

We are a long way from succeeding in this effort, but here is what has happened: In the last quarter of 2009, nearly 800,000 Americans lost their jobs. Tomorrow we will hear the reports for the month of January. They won't be good. But they will be a lot better than 800,000 people losing their jobs, which is what happened in the last quarter of the year before last year. We've seen growth in the fourth quarter at 5.7 percent. That means nothing to you if you're still looking at the want ads, but it means that there is reason to think that jobs are on the way.

And what have we heard about this? The chief economic adviser to President MCCAIN's Presidential campaign said that the key factor of that growth taking place was the recovery bill that we passed last February. Those are his words, not mine. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, estimates that as many as 2.4 million jobs have been created as a result of the recovery bill. We have a long way to go. We have laid out our plan to get there. Frankly, the minority has not laid out a plan, and we look forward to them doing so.

The second thing that you need to do is to restrain and reduce spending. Most people will agree that the number one spending problem is entitlements, and the number one entitlement problem is health care. There are two ways to reduce health care spending. The first way is to restrain spending right now in existing programs. That's what we did. In November, a bill came to this floor to reform the country's health care system that would have stopped what I believe are wasteful payments to health care providers and people making money off the system to the tune of $480 billion, real deficit reduction that we all voted for. No one—with one exception—on the other side voted to do that.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman. The second way to reduce health care costs is to change the health care system so there is more competition, so that insurance companies have to compete for people's business and keep costs down that way. We'll all have a chance to vote on a bill that does that next week.

And yes, the third thing that I think you have to do is to raise some revenue. The President and most of us ran on this proposition. We do believe that couples who make more than $250,000 a year and individuals who make more than $200,000 a year should be asked to pay the tax rates that they paid before the Bush tax cuts of 2001. Now we heard in 1993 that this would ruin the economy. It would cause calamity. It would be the end of the American economy as we know it. Mr. Gingrich said this. Others said this. They were wrong. After they said these things, the economy created 23 million new jobs. When we followed their way, the economy lost jobs in the succeeding 8 years.

The American people want to know what we intend to do, and we've said what we intend to do. We know it can be better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, it's a good thing we're here on the floor of the House where we're exempt from things like deceptive practices, because this body would be guilty today. Here we are with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010. Madam Speaker, 32 pages of this 56-page bill are exemptions to pay-as-you-go. So 32 pages are—Oh, we say we're going to have pay-as-you-go—but 32 of the 56 pages are, I'm sorry, but it does not apply to the following items. Madam Speaker, that's deceptive.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the favorite son of Dallas, Texas, the gentleman Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Madam Speaker, I heard one of my Democratic colleagues say that today is a historic day, that there is a historic opportunity. And yes, history is being made today because never in the history of America has the debt limit been increased to $14.294 trillion. Here we are again, just a few months later, enacting yet another increase in the debt limit. The new debt limit, again, $14.3 trillion, costing every American household over $120,000.

What do I hear from my Democratic colleagues? Well, we hear the old blame game. That's the first thing that we hear. We hear a lot of names from the past. Well, facts are pesky things, Madam Speaker. Listen, there is blame to go around. My party spent too much money. I have a chart right here. It's Congress that controls the purse strings, as we all know. And when the Republicans controlled Congress—this is the blue—these were our deficits. They averaged about $104 billion a year. I'm embarrassed about that. It's much too high. Now in their 3 years of control by the Democrats, we have deficits that are averaging over $1 trillion, $1.1 trillion. That's the difference. What was once our annual deficits have become their monthly deficits, Madam Speaker. That's totally unacceptable.

More history was made earlier this week when the President submitted his proposed budget that so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to embrace. It made history. It is breathtaking in its red ink. It spends $3.8 trillion. The largest budget in American history is being proposed. It proposes a $1.6 trillion deficit, the highest deficit in the history of our Nation, over 10 percent of our economy. We haven't seen debt-to-economy ratios like this since World War II. It triples the national debt in just 10 years. Yes, this is a historic day because, once again, we are here to accommodate the spending agenda of the Democrats with a historic new increase in the debt limit.

Madam Speaker, I will just ask this question: Where are the jobs? We were told that if we went off and if we passed this government stimulus plan, that somehow unemployment would never go above 8 percent. What do we have? We have an extra $1 trillion in debt from that act, and we are still mired in double-digit unemployment. You cannot spend, borrow and bail out your way to prosperity.

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman. Again, we have seen it. It's almost a year later, and yet the Democrats continue to try more of the same. Borrow, spend, bail out your way into prosperity. And what do we have? Again, an additional $1.2 trillion in debt, and over 3 million more of our fellow countrymen have lost their jobs.

Small businesses are wondering who's going to pay for all this? They're concerned about the $2 trillion takeover of health care. Who's going to pay for that? They're concerned about the threatened $800 billion carbon tax, the energy tax. Who is going to pay for that? The omnibuses. Is it any wonder that jobs are not being created in America?

I speak, Madam Speaker, to small businessmen and investors every week, and they tell me, We're too scared to create jobs in this environment. Are we going to have rapid inflation? Are there going to be huge tax increases? Are Congress and the President going to vilify us once again? And my colleagues wonder where, where are the jobs.

You cannot borrow and spend and bail out your way to prosperity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), another member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, getting sailing lessons from the captains of the economic Titanic may be interesting but not very helpful. Let's get serious. Allowing the U.S. Treasury to default on our Nation's debt for the first time in history is not a responsible option. It would devastate our economy, our stock market, and our children's futures. Republicans know it, and Democrats know it. We all know it.

The responsible action is to start getting control of our deficits today, and we can do that by passing the pay-as-you-go law. Pay-as-you-go is a principle that citizens understand and live by every day. It's a principle that helped Congress in the late 1990s turn the largest deficits in American history, created by some of those who have just spoken, into the largest surpluses in American history.

Unfortunately, the Republican House leadership killed the House pay-as-you-go rule that had worked so well. It killed it in 2002. And what happened? The largest surpluses in our history turned into the largest deficits in American history. The Republican-led Congress passed massive unpaid-for tax cuts and the largest expansion of Medicare without paying for a dime of that. Those two actions alone added $6 trillion to our national debt over a period of just one decade, $6 trillion, most of which was borrowed from the Chinese and other foreign governments. It's time to put some discipline back into our Federal budget processes, and that is what pay-as-you-go is all about.

I am proud to have initiated the effort to make this law, this PAYGO, not a temporary law but a permanent law. Had we done that in the 1990s, we wouldn't be facing the terrible deficits that we hear decried today. Pay-as-you-go works for families, pay-as-you-go works for businesses, and then in the 1990s, it worked for the American people in the Federal budget. And when we pass this into law, it will work once again and help us get these intolerable Federal deficits back under control and preserve our children's futures.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, once again, a hyperbole that does not match the action. Out of the 56 pages of this bill, 32 pages are exemptions to pay-as-you-go, 32 of the 56 pages that our good friends are touting as the answer and the right way to do it. But most intriguing is that we've heard that the way to do it is the way it's being done here, because it's open and honest.

□ 1215

There is not even a vote on the debt limit; it's self-executed in the rule. So let's go and vote for PAYGO and talk about how responsible we are. Oh, at the same time, make sure we fund what we've done, $1.9 trillion. The Rules Committee is pretty good up there, Madam Speaker. Know how to hide things. Know how to obfuscate the real facts of the case. The facts of the case are the American people know what's going on. They K-N-O-W what is going on. Over the last year, I've heard from constituents also, and they want a good economy and they want jobs. And the Democrat majority is simply not stepping up to this.

I'm going to encourage a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule when it's our time to get that done. Just so our colleagues understand this, we're going to have a vote on this one here today.

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express great concern on behalf of our children and our grandchildren who are going to bear the burden of this expansion of our national debt. Today we're going to vote on the sixth increase in the debt limit in the past 2½ years. After today we will have added $4 trillion to the government credit limit. Who's going to pay this bill? Congress must address the root of this debt limit increase. It's the spending.

I want to point to a chart here that the President the other night came and talked to us about his spending freeze. So here is the impact of the freeze on spending. I know it's a little hard to tell, but if you look real closely, you see that you get a 49.27 percent growth in spending without the freeze, but with the freeze you get a 49.01 percent increase in spending.

It's a gimmick. This whole PAYGO thing is a sham. We just had a gentleman in New York that was doing a kind of a sham transaction, and he's probably going to—in fact, he is in prison for a Ponzi scheme. That's what this whole situation is is a Ponzi scheme, because what we're doing is we're borrowing and spending and borrowing and spending; we're borrowing the money to make the interest payments on the debt that we already have. And what do the Democrats want to do? They want to borrow some more money.

If you were serious about spending, I offered two amendments yesterday to the Rules Committee that would have put some caps on spending, would have begun to decelerate the growth of government. Those rules, are they eligible to be considered on this floor today? No, they were denied.

You see, if we keep putting off and playing the Ponzi scheme game, we're going to keep running up the debt for our children and our grandchildren. What does PAYGO really mean, the PAYGO vote that we're going to have? It means the American people get to pay and the Democrats get to go spending, taxing and borrowing, just like they've been doing since they took control of this House 3 years ago. But they want you to think today that they have brought some real reform to this body. We passed PAYGO in 2007. Guess what we've done since we've passed PAYGO? We've raised the debt limit five times. And, in fact, in 1998, of the bills that came across this floor, 98 percent of the time, PAYGO was either waived or exempted from that.

And as the gentleman pointed out a while ago, and I appreciate him doing that, a majority of the text of this bill isn't about how we're going to cut spending; it's about the things that we're going to waive that aren't going to be subject to PAYGO. So if we're serious about cutting spending in this country because we're serious about this debt, then why aren't we taking steps that really are going to address spending? The reason that they don't want to address spending is they don't intend to cut spending. They intend to raise taxes. I encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this debate is laughable. During the Republican-controlled Congress and under President Bush from 2002 to 2006 the debt limit was raised by over $3 trillion. That's just a fact. You can't deny that. Secondly, why are they so against PAYGO? Why are they so against being responsible? Because they have an alternative plan. And we saw the outline of that alternative plan in the Budget Committee the other day, and their plan is to try to reduce the deficit and balance the budget by going after Medicare and Social Security, privatizing Medicare, privatizing Social Security, letting Medicare wither on the vine, going after these programs, which is something they have tried to do time and time again.

But let me just say this for the record: while the Democrats control this Congress, we're not going to let you destroy the two most important social programs that have ever been enacted in this country.

At this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I find it interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, say that this is a sham. You know what? It was the law for a decade under the Clinton administration, and I guess it wasn't a sham because the first thing the Republicans did was to repeal PAYGO so that they could run up the massive deficits of the Bush years. We're asking to put this back in place because this is how we cleaned up the unsustainable deficits of the Reagan years. This is how we got, for the first time, a surplus for this country that evaporated in the Republican irresponsibility. PAYGO's not a sham. There's no more sacred cows.

The fact of the matter is, you'll have to choose your priorities. Our priorities may be different, but you don't get to charge them off to the future. You're either going to pay for them, you're going to raise revenues, or you're going to cut something else. The fact is it worked and it worked and it worked and it worked and the deficit came down. And the fact of the matter is, I offered this in 1983, but it couldn't get to Congress because they thought it was too tough. Finally, under President Clinton we did it and the deficits came down, and we left you with an inheritance of $5 trillion that you squandered, you wasted. And now you want not to play by the rules. The rules are you should pay as you go.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I'd love to engage the gentleman if he would take the time; but I'd like to ask him, if he says it's so good, why are 32 of the 56 pages exemptions to PAYGO? And I would like to find out if this is so real——

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I'll be happy to respond because those were some of the same exemptions that existed in the law, and the fact is the deficit came down. We erased the $300 billion annual deficits of the Reagan administration. We did it over time, and we left you $5 trillion that you squandered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Good. I'd like the gentleman to address why are 32 of the 56 pages——

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. It's the same law we had before.

Mr. SESSIONS. Oh, we're going to blame it on Ronald Reagan now. I reclaim my time and I appreciate the gentleman for blaming this on Ronald Reagan. I tell you what, I would be very pleased to engage in a dialogue with the gentleman if you'll answer one question.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SESSIONS. Why are you down on the floor, your party saying this is the real deal and yet 32 of the 56 pages exempt spending?

Mr. ANDREWS. May I answer the question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would enjoy the gentleman doing that. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. They do not exempt spending. Here's what they say. As the gentleman knows, the structure of this bill is that increases in mandatory spending or decreases in revenue must be offset. There are four exceptions, the so-called ''doctor fix,'' the SGR payments; middle class tax cuts; the estate tax fix, which I think both parties have tried to support.

Mr. SESSIONS. Then why are we—we did the same thing but now it's okay for you.

Mr. ANDREWS. If I may, I'm trying to answer. Would the gentleman yield so I could answer?

Mr. SESSIONS. I am engaging with the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. The pages the gentleman is talking about are what are called the sequestration rules; and what that means is, if the Congress violates pay-as-you-go, and it spends more than it should under those rules, then there is an automatic reduction in spending to make the so-called score card balance out, to make sure things are brought into balance. Sequestration has happened once in the years that pay-as-you-go were in effect. It was when Mr. Darman was Budget Director. It has never happened before. What these rules say is if there's a sequestration, there are certain programs that are off limits to the sequestration. But they're not exceptions to the PAYGO rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman. You know, I think the best evidence, and reclaiming my time, I think the best evidence that this is not working is the deficit rising from $161 billion in 2007, to $1.4 trillion last year and $1.6 trillion this year; $161 billion in '07 to last year, $1.4 trillion and this year $1.6 trillion.

I would say that the preponderance of the evidence does not support the hypothesis. Today, in this rule, we didn't really debate the debt limit about being honest about the vote; but we're going to go ahead and have an opportunity, Madam Speaker, when my colleagues vote "no" on the previous question, that we will be allowed to amend this rule to consider an end to the TARP Act to stop the bailouts which are a part of this problem. This act would immediately terminate the Troubled Asset Relief Program and reduce the debt ceiling by the amount of remaining authorized TARP funds, which is nearly now $200 billion.

We cannot continue what we're doing, spending taxpayer dollars and having these bailout programs. This is an ineffective program.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, America is calling for fiscal responsibility. And I welcome the gentleman from Tyler, Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we can agree on some things. Default is not responsible is one of them. It isn't responsible. But there are things that can be done to avoid defaulting other than raising the massive debt ceiling beyond anything anybody ever dreamed of before. And we keep being told that Clinton gave you a balanced budget. The President does not vote on a balanced budget. He signed, and wasn't real happy there at first about signing a balanced budget that was pushed over there by the Republican majority that was voted in in 1994 because of the Democrats' irresponsibility.

And so things went well as the Republicans did what they were elected to do for a time. But you are right: when President Bush got elected, 9/11 happened, and the spending began anew, and it was not responsible as it should have been. And when I was elected in 2004, one of the things that we dealt with was too much spending. And it continued. And some of us fought to bring it down, but it was not enough.

And as a result, the Democrats have been in charge since 2007. And so pay-as-you-go—let me tell you, I was asked earlier today by our whip, ERIC CANTOR. You know, we checked our records. You voted for this one of the times they brought it up last year. Why'd you do that? And I said, it was my mistake. I thought they were serious. But they keep waiving and exempting, keep adding it to bills, and here it is back again. They won't fool me again because I know they're not serious about it anymore.

We heard from Art Laffer, who was the architect behind turning around double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment, double-digit interest rates. How'd he do it? He cut taxes 30 percent. And Art Laffer 2 weeks ago said you want to deal with this deficit? You have so much in the way of assets in the western part of the country. You own most of the country. Start selling some assets. That's what people do who are responsible.

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

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

Mr. GOHMERT. What responsible people do, and I appreciate being lectured on responsible, is they bring down spending immediately. You don't have a President or a head of a household saying we're going to get responsible next year. Yeah, that's it. Next year. No, you do it now. You don't keep going on. And I'll give you a personal, very personal example. We have three kids who have been going through college. We owe a lot on student loans. We have a home that I'm not in 4 or 5 days out of the week. I love that home. I hoped that home would be my home the rest of my life. But we're putting it up for sale because it's an asset; it will allow us to pay off debt.

Let's start selling some of our assets. But instead, oh, no. Last week we voted to buy a bunch of the Virgin Islands. We voted in here, because of the majority, we're going to buy homes in foreign countries for rare dogs and cats. We're going to buy homes for cranes that don't live in this country. It's time to get responsible all right. Let's vote down this bill, and let's come back and be responsible immediately.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again I remind my colleagues of $4 trillion in Bush tax cuts that weren't paid for. And during the Republican-controlled Congress under President Bush from 2002 to 2006 the debt limit was raised by over $3 trillion. I didn't hear any complaints at that time. My colleague talks about selling assets. The problem is the assets they want to sell are Social Security and Medicare, and we don't want any part of it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

□ 1230

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

If we roll the tape back, I can hear, as if it was yesterday, Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Fed, testifying before this Congress—and right after President Bush was sworn into office—about the fact of this $5 trillion surplus and the opportunity to pay off the debt. We were having a discussion about whether it would be good for our economy—this is in the record of this Congress—whether it would be good for our economy to pay off all of our debt or rather we should leave some debt on the books. That is what was projected. It was said at the end of the Bush Presidency, we can be an entirely debt-free country. Well, here we are today in a much different situation.

Now, if you want a balanced budget, then you should follow those people who know how to get us there. Democrats led the way under President Clinton, and we had a surplus. We had a balanced budget. We were paying down national debt. And that is where we are returning our country to, which is a responsible fiscal policy.

And as we see the economic turnaround, gross domestic product, 6 percent in the negative a year ago. We saw $700,000 lost in January a year ago. What we see now is a 5.7 percent increase in gross domestic product. We see purchasing orders up, manufacturing up, in today's report, by 1 percent, which is the second month in a row. We see home sales up. We see a country on the rebound.

And the fact of the matter is that PAYGO, as structured under this rule, not only says that you have to pay as you go, it also directs the Government Accountability Office to look for duplicative programs in the Federal budget that can be cut.

Now, I am going to be offering additional legislation next week on dealing with the debt that has been accumulated by the Republican President and the Republican majority over the last 6 years of the Bush administration, and we can do even more.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I could engage Mr. MCGOVERN for the purpose of letting him know that I am down to my final few minutes, I have two additional speakers. He has a lot of time remaining. I would ask that he engage his speakers and his time as we roll it down.

Mr. McGOVERN. May I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas controls 3 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts controls 9 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself 2 minutes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we don't even need lectures from the Republicans on fiscal discipline. We did it, and we're going to do it again. And the President and the leadership here of this House has outlined how we're going to do it.

But I want to point out that my colleagues on the other side don't like statutory PAYGO. They don't want to pay for tax cuts for rich people or for corporations or for big oil companies because they have a different plan, and their plan is to reprise the Bush-era proposal to privatize Medicare and Social Security.

In the Budget Committee the other day, the ranking Republican introduced his plan, which makes it very clear that he wants to privatize Social Security and Medicare. Ezra Klein of The Washington Post writes, This proposal would take Medicare from costing an expected 14.3 percent of GDP in 2080 to less than 4 percent. That's trillions of dollars not going to health care for seniors. The audacity is breathtaking.

The Congressional Budget Office said of that proposal that starting in 2021, new enrollees would no longer receive coverage through their current program but instead would be given a voucher with which to purchase private health insurance. CBO says traditional benefits would be reduced below those scheduled on the current laws for many workers who are aged 55 or younger in 2011.

Peter Orszag, the Director of OMB, says, The proposal takes the Medicare program and, for those 55 and below, turns it into a voucher program and that it introduces individual accounts privatizing Social Security.

Madam Speaker, we have some challenges before us, but I would like to think that we can all agree that balancing the budget by letting Medicare wither on the vine and privatizing Social Security and destroying two of the most important social programs in the history of the country is not the way to go. And so that is the choice.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

We do what's fiscally responsible and enact the statutory PAYGO and pay as you go. If you want to increase education programs or programs for health care, you have to find an offset. You have to cut another program to find additional revenue. If you want to give tax cuts to rich people, you've got to pay for it. But I think that's the responsible way to go. Going their way, going after Medicare and Social Security, is the wrong way. We've seen this movement before. We don't want to go there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, spin zone. I love it. The gentleman is talking about all these Republicans want to privatize Social Security and Medicare. We're responsible. Well, what the gentleman forgot is it's the Democrats' proposal that takes $400 billion out of Medicare, $400 billion. Those are not only talking points from the 1990s that the gentleman is hung up on, it's not truthful.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) 1 minute.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this self-executing rule which will raise our national debt to nearly $2 trillion. That's 12 zeros. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can immediately have the House consider H.R. 4566, the END TARP Act, that will end the TARP bailout program once and for all, saving taxpayers about $200 billion.

In the most recent report, the Special Inspector General of TARP himself said the program has failed to boost bank lending and it's also failed in halting the spread of home foreclosures. If the program isn't helping small businesses, if the program isn't helping homeowners, two of its major goals, why do we consider to throw hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer money at it?

It's time we got serious about fixing our national fiscal house and spending problems. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that they can bring up the END TARP Act. We can end the bailouts once and for all and not raise the debt ceiling by nearly $2 trillion.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I again inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls 6½ minutes and the gentleman from Texas controls 1½ minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we have had an enlightening debate here today, and I guess the difference between Democrats and Republicans couldn't be clearer and this debate couldn't come at a better time.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that we should balance the budget by going after Medicare and Social Security. They introduced an alternative budget in the Budget Committee. It's there in black and white. It's easy to understand. No one denies it. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) who was on the floor earlier was on MSNBC talking about the need to ''reengineer Social Security,'' which is a code word for privatization.

My colleagues on the other side say they don't support PAYGO and they don't support increasing the debt limit. I guess that means they'd rather play politics than act responsibly to fix the problems that this country faces.

President Obama said that fixing this economy would not be easy and it would not happen overnight, and that's clear. He took office and he implemented a bold plan to jump-start the economy, and in the fourth quarter, we saw the U.S. economy grow at a 5.7 percent rate. Mark Zandi, the cofounder of Moody's Economy.com and former McCain economic adviser, said, We're headed in the right direction. The recovery has begun. I think prospects are that job growth will continue and we will have enough job growth to bring up unemployment and then good things will happen. That's a Republican economist.

Instead of working together to fix the economy, my Republican colleagues have decided to try and use this recession for political gain. They've obstructed and opposed all efforts to jump-start the economy. They voted against the Recovery Act, which put millions of people to work and saved millions of jobs. They would have rather fired cops and firefighters and teachers. They would have denied new emerging industries the important money to hire more people. They voted against the jobs creation bill and, except for one brave vote, against the health care bill that, according to CBO, would reduce the deficit. Instead, they have dusted off the tired old standbys: corporate tax cuts and privatization of Social Security and Medicare. Unfortunately, they're stuck in the past and are simply repeating the mistakes that put us here in the first place.

Madam Speaker, we were elected to do responsible things, to do what's right. We were elected to solve problems and to make this country a better place. Democrats say we cannot default on our debt and that we will reduce that debt through PAYGO, bending the cost curve of health care and freezing spending.

I believe we need to look at all parts of Federal spending, including wasteful and unnecessary spending at the Defense Department, but it's clear we need to prioritize our spending. In fact, Democrats say we're going to cut capital gains—something that Republicans have been touting for years—but Republicans are opposing that, too, simply because President Obama is proposing it.

Madam Speaker, there is a time and a place for politics, and I get that. But to paraphrase JOHN MCCAIN, sometimes you have to put the country first. It's unfortunate that my Republican colleagues would rather play politics instead of acting responsibly to attack our country's problems.

Madam Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, in the remaining time, I would just like to say that I think the American people are watching and they are listening, and they heard a good debate here on the floor about these corporations that Republicans try and get all of these tax breaks for. I'd like to remind the gentleman those are called employers, and employers in this country have the second highest tax rate of any country in the world.

Darn right Republicans are trying to cut taxes, because we want the American people to get employed again, and attacking employers is the key thrust of what the Democratic objective is all about. No wonder we've lost jobs. We're attacking employers, attacking employers. The President, the gentleman Mr. HOYER, the Speaker, Mrs. PELOSI, attacking employers. No wonder we've got an unemployment problem.

But this budget is filled with reckless spending and unsustainable debt. Don't blame that on somebody else. Accept the responsibility yourself. This is the biggest budget we've ever had. And for the President to come and say, as a takeaway, Just as you know, American people, we're going to start this spending process to where we freeze spending, it's really a joke.

The bottom line is the American people know what the problem is. They've clued in on it. They even know the pages of the bills where they have seen the majority party try and take advantage of the taxpayer, rip health care out from their advantage where they could have their own health care, take dollars away from their employers and tax them.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I will tell you, the Republican Party is going to stand up for jobs again today.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls 3½ minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Before I yield to our last speaker, let me again just remind my colleagues what this debate is about. It is about whether we should pay as we go. That is what families do. That is what we should do here. I don't know why that's a radical idea in the Republican Conference, but it's the responsible thing to do.

My friends on the other side are responsible for creating this economic mess. They should share that responsibility with us now to get this economy out of the ditch.

And one final thing, Madam Speaker, trying to balance the budget by going after Social Security and Medicare is the wrong way to go. These are important programs that provide important benefits, mostly to our senior citizens, and we should not allow them to wither on the vine and be subject to a Republican budget that would basically take a meat-ax to those programs. That is the wrong way to go.

□ 1245

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, again, I would remind my colleagues that we are facing tough times, but tough times require tough decisions. And statutory pay-as-you-go to basically pay our way is the responsible thing. We can't keep on adding to our deficits and to our debt. We have responsibility to our kids and our grandkids. I would ask my Republican colleagues to join with us. If they don't want to do it, then I guess we will have to do the responsible thing on our own.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote for the rule.

I yield the remaining time to our distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The last time we voted on this issue, the floor was packed on both sides of the aisle. And I observed at that time that, and I repeat today, I really doubt that there are any of the 435 of us, Madam Speaker, who believe that this matter that is included in this rule ought to be defeated. I would hope that's the case.

The gentleman who represents the minority party on the Rules Committee has confronted this issue in the past. He confronted it in 2002. He confronted it in 2003. He confronted it in 2004 and again in 2005. On each of those occasions, he voted to increase the debt limit. His party was in charge. Unfortunately, my party voted against it at that point in time because we weren't in charge.

The point I make is that the American public too often believes that we do not do what we think is the responsible thing for our country but what we think is the right thing to do from the perspective of our party. They are not impressed by that kind of action. In fact, not only did Mr. SESSIONS vote to increase the debt limit on numerous occasions, many of us voted against it essentially for the same reasons, because we said the other party had incurred liabilities with which we did not agree. In fact, I'm sure all 435 of us could say we incurred certain liabilities in which we did not agree.

But the fact of the matter is that America, voting through its representatives in the House and in the Senate, incurred those liabilities. Creditors throughout the world relied on the fact that the United States of America, the world's wealthiest Nation, would, in fact, pay its bills.

I will say that in the future when this issue comes up, I will not repeat again the mistakes that I made in the past. I said that last time. And if it so happens at some time in the future the other party is in control and we come to the necessity of ensuring that America can pay its bills, it will be my intention to vote with the majority party to increase the debt limit—not because I want to see us deficit spend; I don't. I voted for constitutional amendments to balance the budget to constrain the spending of this body.

In a few minutes, I will speak strongly in favor of adopting statutory PAYGO, which is made in order by this rule. Statutory PAYGO will be a constraint on the spending that this Congress votes for, a restraint to bring in line spending on mandatory items with the revenues and abilities that we have.

And so I say to both sides of the aisle, this is not a vote about party. This is a vote about country. There is no one in this room, no one who has raised his or her hand to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, not one of us who honestly can say that it is an alternative available to us to not ensure that America can pay its bills. That's what this is about.

That's why my friends on the Republican side, when you were in charge, you voted, in some cases almost to a person, almost unanimously, to increase the debt five times under President Bush.

Very frankly, I tell my friends on the Republican side, when President Bush was in office, we did the same thing you're going to do today. We pretended that somehow because we did not agree with the policies that had led us to the place where we had incurred those debts that somehow we would take no responsibility for paying those debts. Ladies and gentlemen, our creditors around the world on whom we are now relying in order to fund our government don't really care about our partisan politics. They do care, however, about the will that we have to meet our responsibilities to pay our bills and to meet our obligations to them.

Everybody understands that if we did not increase this debt limit, at some point in time, not too long thereafter, checks to Social Security recipients would have to stop, checks to veterans would have to stop, and checks to employees who work for the government would have to stop. No one thinks that's a rational alternative. We may think there ought to be less or more, but no one thinks that we ought to have none.

And so I say to my colleagues this is a vote for American responsibility, not Republican responsibility or Democratic responsibility, but for American responsibility.

Both of us—both of us have pursued politics in this matter. The American public is hopeful, as we all can see, that at some point in time we all realize that playing politics is not the policy that Americans want us to pursue. They want us to pursue the well-being of our country and of our citizens. We've incurred debts. We expect people to pay the debts they owe us, and they, in turn, expect the same. That's what this vote is about.

And so there are not a lot of Members on this floor. I hope a lot of Members, Madam Speaker, are watching, because I hope when they come to this floor to vote for this rule, which will deem the authorization of the ability of America to meet its responsibilities, that they will vote for their country, for our citizens, and for our responsibility. It's the right thing to do.

Every one of us on each side of the aisle, Republican or Democratic, knows it's the right thing to do. Let's do the right thing. I urge support of this rule. I urge support of the statutory PAYGO provision made in order by this rule, which will say that, notwithstanding the fact that we have authorized additional debt, we are also, at the same time, going to constrain the incurring of additional debt beyond that which we are prepared to pay for. That's what families have to do. That's what we need to do.

Vote for this rule. It's the right thing to do.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1065

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4566) to terminate authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4566.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam 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. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 1022;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1065;

Adopting House Resolution 1065, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4532.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HONORING MEDGAR EVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1022, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1022.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Cole
Gutierrez
Murtha
Radanovich
Thompson (PA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

□ 1320

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. SCHAUER changed their vote from ‘‘nay’’ to ‘‘yea.’’

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 45, INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona). The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1065, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 195, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Gutierrez
Murtha
Radanovich
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1332

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

AYES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—212

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Massa
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Owens
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Gutierrez
Murtha
Radanovich
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1351

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.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY APPLICANTS' ACCESS TO PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4532, 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 Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4532.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 6, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—412

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey

Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—6

Campbell
Coffman (CO)
Gohmert
King (IA)
Lummis
McClintock

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Berman
Boehner
Clay
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Gutierrez
Linder
Murtha
Radanovich
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stupak
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1401

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House Chamber today, due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 39 through 47.

INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1065, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, with a Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof $14,294,000,000,000.

TITLE I—STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2010

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to reestablish a statutory procedure to enforce a rule of budget neutrality on new revenue and direct spending legislation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS.

As used in this title—

(1) The term ''BBEDCA'' means the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) The definitions set forth in section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and in section 250 of BBEDCA shall apply to this title, except to the extent that they are specifically modified as follows:

(A) The term ''outyear'' means a fiscal year one or more years after the budget year.

(B) In section 250(c)(8)(C), the reference to the food stamp program shall be deemed to be a reference to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

(3) The term ''AMT'' means the Alternative Minimum Tax for individuals under sections 55–59 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the term ''EGTRRA'' means the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–16), and the term ''JGTRRA'' means the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief and Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–27).

(4)(A) The term ''budgetary effects'' means the amount by which PAYGO legislation changes outlays flowing from direct spending or revenues relative to the baseline and shall be determined on the basis of estimates prepared under section 4. Budgetary effects that increase outlays flowing from direct spending or decrease revenues are termed ''costs'' and budgetary effects that increase revenues or decrease outlays flowing from direct spending are termed ''savings''. Budgetary effects shall not include any costs associated with debt service.

(B) For purposes of these definitions, off-budget effects shall not be counted as budgetary effects.

(C) Solely for purposes of recording entries on a PAYGO scorecard, provisions in appropriation Acts are also considered to be budgetary effects for purposes of this title if such provisions make outyear modifications to substantive law, except that provisions for which the outlay effects net to zero over a period consisting of the current year, the budget year, and the 4 subsequent years shall not be considered budgetary effects. For purposes of this paragraph, the term, ''modifications to substantive law'' refers to changes to or restrictions on entitlement law or other mandatory spending contained in appropriations Acts, notwithstanding section 250(c)(8) of BBEDCA. Provisions in appropriations Acts that are neither outyear modifications to substantive law nor changes in revenues have no budgetary effects for purposes of this title.

(5) The term ''debit'' refers to the net total amount, when positive, by which costs recorded on the PAYGO scorecards for a fiscal year exceed savings recorded on those scorecards for that year.

(6) The term ''entitlement law'' refers to a section of law which provides entitlement authority.

(7) The term ''PAYGO legislation'' or a ''PAYGO Act'' refers to a bill or joint resolution that affects direct spending or revenue relative to the baseline. The budgetary effects of changes in revenues and outyear modifications to substantive law included in appropriation Acts as defined in paragraph (4) shall be treated as if they were contained in PAYGO legislation or a PAYGO Act.

(8) The term ''timing shift'' refers to a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from the ninth outyear to the tenth outyear or an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from the tenth outyear to the ninth outyear.

SEC. 4. PAYGO ESTIMATES AND PAYGO SCORECARDS.

(a) PAYGO ESTIMATES.—

(1) REQUIRED DESIGNATION IN PAYGO ACTS.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—To establish the budgetary effects of a PAYGO Act consistent with the determination made by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, a PAYGO Act originated in or amended by the House of Representatives may include the following statement: ''The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled 'Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.''.

(B) SENATE.—To establish the budgetary effects of a PAYGO Act consistent with the determination made by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, a PAYGO Act originated in or amended by the Senate shall include the following statement: ''The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled 'Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.''.

(C) CONFERENCE REPORTS AND AMENDMENTS BETWEEN THE HOUSES.—To establish the budgetary effects of the conference report on a PAYGO Act, or an amendment to an amendment between Houses on a PAYGO Act, which if estimated shall be estimated jointly by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, the conference report or amendment between the Houses shall include the following statement: ''The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled 'Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation' for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on this conference report or amendment between the Houses.''.

(2) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO ACTS.—

(A) ORIGINAL LEGISLATION.—

(i) STATEMENT AND ESTIMATE.—Prior to a vote on passage of a PAYGO Act originated or amended by one House, the Chairman of the Budget Committee of that House may submit for printing in the Congressional Record a statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' which shall include an estimate of the budgetary effects of that Act, if available prior to passage of the Act by that House and shall submit, if applicable, an identification of any

current policy adjustments made pursuant to section 7 of this Act. The timely submission of such a statement, in conjunction with the appropriate designation made pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B), as applicable, shall establish the budgetary effects of the PAYGO Act for the purposes of this Act.

(ii) EFFECT.—The latest statement submitted by the Chairman of the Budget Committee of that House prior to passage shall supersede any prior statements submitted in the Congressional Record and shall be valid only if the PAYGO Act is not further amended by either House.

(iii) FAILURE TO SUBMIT ESTIMATE.—If—

(I) the estimate required by clause (i) has not been submitted prior to passage by that House;

(II) such estimate has been submitted but is no longer valid due to a subsequent amendment to the PAYGO Act; or

(III) the designation required pursuant to this subsection has not been made;

the budgetary effects of the PAYGO Act shall be determined under subsection (d)(3), provided that this clause shall not apply if a valid designation is subsequently included in that PAYGO Act pursuant to paragraph (1)(C) and a statement is submitted pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) CONFERENCE REPORTS AND AMENDMENTS BETWEEN HOUSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the adoption of a report of a committee of conference on a PAYGO Act in either House, or disposition of an amendment to an amendment between Houses on a PAYGO Act, the Chairmen of the Budget Committees of the House and Senate may jointly submit for printing in the Congressional Record a statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' which shall include an estimate of the budgetary effects of that Act if available prior to passage of the Act by the House acting first on the legislation and shall submit, if applicable, an identification of any current policy adjustments made pursuant to section 7 of this title. The timely submission of such a statement, in conjunction with the appropriate designation made pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), shall establish the budgetary effects of the PAYGO Act for the purposes of this Act.

(ii) FAILURE TO SUBMIT ESTIMATE.—If such estimate has not been submitted prior to the adoption of a report of a committee of conference by either House, or if the designation required pursuant to this subsection has not been made, the budgetary effects of the PAYGO Act shall be determined under subsection (d)(3).

(3) PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, upon submission of a statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee for printing in the Congressional Record, the Legislative Clerk shall read the statement.

(4) JURISDICTION OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEES.—For the purposes of enforcing section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, a designation made pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(C), that includes only the language specifically prescribed therein, shall not be considered a matter within the jurisdiction of either the Senate or House Committees on the Budget.

(b) CBO PAYGO ESTIMATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ESTIMATES.—Section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CBO PAYGO ESTIMATES.—

''(A) The Chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate, as applicable, shall request from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office an estimate of the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation.

''(B) Estimates shall be prepared using baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office, consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(C) The Director shall not count timing shifts, as that term is defined at section 3(8) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, in estimates of the budgetary effects of PAYGO Legislation.''.

(B) SIDEHEADING.—The side heading of section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''Reports on''.

(2) GUIDELINES.—Section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) Scorekeeping Guidelines.—Estimates under this section shall be provided in accordance with the scorekeeping guidelines determined under section 252(d)(5) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(c) CURRENT POLICY ADJUSTMENTS FOR CERTAIN LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any provision of legislation that meets the criteria in subsection (c), (d), (e) or (f) of section 7, the Chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate, as applicable, shall request that CBO adjust the estimate of budgetary effects of that legislation pursuant to paragraph (2) for the purposes of this title. A single piece of legislation may contain provisions that meet criteria in more than one of the subsections referred to in the preceding sentence. CBO shall adjust estimates for legislation designated under subsection (a) and estimated under subsection (b). OMB shall adjust estimates for legislation estimated under subsection (d)(3).

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) ESTIMATES.—CBO or OMB, as applicable, shall exclude from the estimate of budgetary effects any budgetary effects of a provision that meets the criteria in subsection (c), (d), (e) or (f) of section 7, to the extent that those budgetary effects, when combined with all other excluded budgetary effects of any other previously designated provisions of enacted legislation under the same subsection of section 7, do not exceed the maximum applicable current policy adjustment defined under the applicable subsection of section 7 for the applicable 10-year period.

(B) BASELINE.—Any estimate made pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be prepared using baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office, consistent with section 257 of the BBEDCA. CBO estimates of legislation adjusted for current policy shall include a separate presentation of costs excluded from the calculation of budgetary effects for the legislation, as well as an updated total of all excluded costs of provisions within subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 7, as applicable, and in the case of paragraph (1) of section 7(f), within any of the subparagraphs (A) through (L) of such paragraph, as applicable.

(3) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF EXCESS SAVINGS.—

(A) PROHIBITION ON USE OF EXCESS SAVING FOR INELIGIBLE POLICIES.—To the extent the adjustment for current policy of any provision estimated under this subsection exceeds the estimated budgetary effects of that provision, these excess savings shall not be available to offset the costs of any provisions not otherwise eligible for a current policy adjustment under section 7, and shall not be counted on the PAYGO scorecards established pursuant to subsections (d)(4) and (d)(5).

(B) PROHIBITION ON USE OF EXCESS SAVINGS ACROSS BUDGET AREAS.—For provisions eligible for a current policy adjustment under subsections (c) through (f) of section 7, to the extent the adjustment for current policy of any provision exceeds the estimated budgetary effects of that same provision, the excess savings shall be available only to offset the costs of other provisions that qualify for a current policy adjustment in that same subsection. Each paragraph in section 7(f)(1) shall be considered a separate subsection for purposes of this section.

(4) FURTHER GUIDANCE ON ESTIMATING BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Estimates of budgetary effects under this subsection shall be consistent with the guidance provided at section 7(h).

(5) INCLUSION OF STATEMENT.—For PAYGO legislation adjusted pursuant to section 7, the Chairman of the House or Senate Budget Committee, as applicable, shall include in any statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'', submitted for that legislation pursuant to section 4, an explanation of the current policy designation and adjustments.

(d) OMB PAYGO SCORECARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—OMB shall maintain and make publicly available a continuously updated document containing two PAYGO scorecards displaying the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation as determined under section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, applying the look-back requirement in subsection (e) and the averaging requirement in subsection (f), and a separate addendum displaying the estimates of the costs of provisions designated in statute as emergency requirements.

(2) ESTIMATES IN LEGISLATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), in making the calculations for the PAYGO scorecards, OMB shall use the budgetary effects included by reference in the applicable legislation pursuant to subsection (a).

(3) OMB PAYGO ESTIMATES.—If a PAYGO Act does not contain a valid reference to its budgetary effects consistent with subsection (a), OMB shall estimate the budgetary effects of that legislation upon its enactment. The OMB estimate shall be based on the approaches to scorekeeping set forth in section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended by this title, and subsection (g)(4), and shall use the same economic and technical assumptions as used in the most recent budget submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31 of the United States Code.

(4) 5-YEAR SCORECARD.—The first scorecard shall display the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation in each year over the 5-year period beginning in the budget year.

(5) 10-YEAR SCORECARD.—The second scorecard shall display the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation in each year over the 10-year period beginning in the budget year.

(6) COMMUNITY LIVING ASSISTANCE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS ACT.—Neither scorecard maintained by OMB pursuant to this subsection shall include net savings from any provisions of legislation titled ''Community Living Assistance Services and Supports Act'', which establishes a Federal insurance program for long-term care, if such legislation is enacted into law, or amended, subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(e) LOOK-BACK TO CAPTURE CURRENT-YEAR EFFECTS.—For purposes of this section, OMB shall treat the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation enacted during a session of Congress that occur during the current year as though they occurred in the budget year.

(f) AVERAGING USED TO MEASURE COMPLIANCE OVER 5-YEAR AND 10-YEAR PERIODS.—OMB shall cumulate the budgetary effects of a PAYGO Act over the budget year (which includes any look-back effects under subsection (e)) and—

(1) for purposes of the 5-year scorecard referred to in subsection (d)(4), the four subsequent outyears, divide that cumulative total by five, and enter the quotient in the budget-year column and in each subsequent column of the 5-year PAYGO scorecard; and

(2) for purposes of the 10-year scorecard referred to in subsection (d)(5), the nine subsequent outyears, divide that cumulative total by ten, and enter the quotient in the budget-year column and in each subsequent column of the 10-year PAYGO scorecard.

(g) EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—

(1) DESIGNATION IN STATUTE.—If a provision of direct spending or revenue legislation in a PAYGO Act is enacted as an emergency requirement that the Congress so designates in statute pursuant to this section, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and revenue in all

fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purposes of this Act.

(2) DESIGNATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a PAYGO Act includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for the purposes of this title, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

(3) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a PAYGO Act, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(B) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(i) WAIVER.—Subparagraph (A) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(ii) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(C) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(D) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subparagraph (A) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(E) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a PAYGO Act, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION ON SCORING.—If a provision is designated as an emergency requirement under this Act, CBO or OMB, as applicable, shall not include the budgetary effects of such a provision in its estimate of the budgetary effects of that PAYGO legislation.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT AND SEQUESTRATION ORDER.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 14 days (excluding weekends and holidays) after Congress adjourns to end a session, OMB shall make publicly available and cause to be printed in the Federal Register an annual PAYGO report. The report shall include an up-to-date document containing the PAYGO scorecards, a description of any current policy adjustments made under section 4(c), information about emergency legislation (if any) designated under section 4(g), information about any sequestration if required by subsection (b), and other data and explanations that enhance public understanding of this title and actions taken under it.

(b) SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—If the annual report issued at the end of a session of Congress under subsection (a) shows a debit on either PAYGO scorecard for the budget year, OMB shall prepare and the President shall issue and include in that report a sequestration order that, upon issuance, shall reduce budgetary resources of direct spending programs by enough to offset that debit as prescribed in section 6. If there is a debit on both scorecards, the order shall fully offset the larger of the two debits. OMB shall transmit the order and the report to the House of Representatives and the Senate. If the President issues a sequestration order, the annual report shall contain, for each budget account to be sequestered, estimates of the baseline level of budgetary resources subject to sequestration, the amount of budgetary resources to be sequestered, and the outlay reductions that will occur in the budget year and the subsequent fiscal year because of that sequestration.

SEC. 6. CALCULATING A SEQUESTRATION.

(a) REDUCING NONEXEMPT BUDGETARY RESOURCES BY A UNIFORM PERCENTAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—OMB shall calculate the uniform percentage by which the budgetary resources of nonexempt direct spending programs are to be sequestered such that the outlay savings resulting from that sequestration, as calculated under subsection (b), shall offset the budget-year debit, if any, on the applicable PAYGO scorecard. If the uniform percentage calculated under the prior sentence exceeds 4 percent, the Medicare programs described in section 256(d) of BBEDCA shall be reduced by 4 percent and the uniform percentage by which the budgetary resources of all other nonexempt direct spending programs are to be sequestered shall be increased, as necessary, so that the sequestration of Medicare and of all other nonexempt direct spending programs together produce the required outlay savings.

(2) PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES IN UNIFIED BUDGET ONLY.—Subject to the exemptions set forth in section 11, OMB shall determine the uniform percentage required under paragraph (1) with respect to programs and activities contained in the unified budget only.

(b) OUTLAY SAVINGS.—In determining the amount by which a sequestration offsets a budget-year debit, OMB shall count—

(1) the amount by which the sequestration in a crop year of crop support payments, pursuant to section 256(j) of BBEDCA, reduces outlays in the budget year and the subsequent fiscal year;

(2) the amount by which the sequestration of Medicare payments in the 12-month period following the sequestration order, pursuant to section 256(d) of BBEDCA, reduces outlays in the budget year and the subsequent fiscal year; and

(3) the amount by which the sequestration in the budget year of the budgetary resources of other nonexempt mandatory programs reduces outlays in the budget year and in the subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT FOR CURRENT POLICIES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for adjustments of estimates of budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation for legislation affecting 4 areas of the budget—

(1) payments made under section 1848 of the Social Security Act (referred to in this section as ''Payment for Physicians' Services'');

(2) the Estate and Gift Tax under subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(3) the AMT; and

(4) provisions of EGTRRA or JGTRRA that amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or provisions in later statutes further amending the amendments made by EGTRRA or JGTRRA), other than—

(A) the provisions of those 2 Acts that were made permanent by the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–280);

(B) amendments to the Estate and Gift Tax referred to in paragraph (2);

(C) the AMT referred to in paragraph (3); and

(D) the income tax rates on ordinary income that apply to individuals with adjusted gross incomes greater than $200,000 for a single filer and $250,000 for joint filers.

(b) DURATION.—This section shall remain in effect through December 31, 2011.

(c) MEDICARE PAYMENTS TO PHYSICIANS.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Legislation that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under subsections (d) and (f) of section 1848 of the Social Security Act shall trigger the current policy adjustment required by this title.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the maximum current policy adjustment shall be the difference between—

(A) estimated net outlays attributable to the payment rates and related parameters in accordance with subsections (d) and (f) of section 1848 of the Social Security Act (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect); and

(B) what those net outlays would have been if—

(i) the nominal payment rates and related parameters in effect for 2009 had been in effect through December 31, 2014, without change; and

(ii) thereafter, the nominal payment rates and related parameters described in subparagraph (A) had applied and the assumption described in clause (i) had never applied.

(3) LIMITATION.—If the provisions in the legislation that cause it to meet the criteria in paragraph (1) cover a time period that ends before December 31, 2014, subject to the maximum adjustment provided for under paragraph (2), the amount of each current policy adjustment made pursuant to this section shall be limited to the difference between—

(A) estimated net outlays attributable to the payment rates and related parameters specified in that section of the Social Security Act (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect for the period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation); and

(B) what those net outlays would have been if the nominal payment rates and related parameters in effect for 2009 had been in effect, without change, for the same period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation as under subparagraph (A).

(d) ESTATE AND GIFT TAX.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Legislation that includes provisions amending the Estate and Gift Tax under subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall trigger the current policy adjustment required by this title.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the maximum current policy adjustment shall be the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect); and

(B) what those revenue collections would have been if, on the date of enactment of the legislation meeting the criteria in paragraph (1), estate and gift tax law had instead been amended so that the tax rates, nominal exemption amounts, and related parameters in effect for tax year 2009 had remained in effect through December 31, 2011, with nominal exemption amounts indexed for inflation after 2009 consistent with subsection (g).

(3) LIMITATION.—If the provisions in the legislation that cause it to meet the criteria in paragraph (1) cover a time period that ends before December 31, 2011, subject to the maximum adjustment provided for under paragraph (2), the amount of each current policy adjustment made pursuant to this section shall be limited to the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect for the period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation); and

(B) what those revenues would have been if the estate and gift tax law rates, nominal exemption amounts, and related parameters in effect for 2009, with nominal exemption amounts

indexed for inflation after 2009 consistent with subsection (g), had been in effect for the same period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation as under subparagraph (A).

(4) DURATION OF POLICY ADJUSTMENT.—Adjustments made pursuant to this subsection are available for policies affecting the estate and gift tax through only December 31, 2011. Any adjustments shall include budgetary effects in all years from these policy changes.

(e) AMT RELIEF.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Legislation that includes provisions extending AMT relief shall trigger the current policy adjustment required by this title.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the maximum current policy adjustment shall be the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect); and

(B) what those revenue collections would have been if, on the date of enactment of legislation meeting the criteria in paragraph (1), AMT law had instead been amended by making commensurate adjustments in the exemption amounts for joint and single filers in such a manner that the number of taxpayers with AMT liability or lost credits that occur as a result of the AMT would not be estimated to exceed the number of taxpayers affected by the AMT in tax year 2008 in any year for which relief is provided, through December 31, 2011.

(3) LIMITATION.—If the provisions in the legislation that cause it to meet the criteria in paragraph (1) cover a time period that ends before December 31, 2011, subject to the maximum adjustment provided for under paragraph (2), the amount of each current policy adjustment made pursuant to this section shall be limited to the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect for the period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation); and

(B) what those revenues would have been if, on the date of enactment of legislation meeting the criteria in paragraph (1), AMT law had instead been amended by making commensurate adjustments in the exemption amounts for joint and single filers in such a manner that the number of taxpayers with AMT liability or lost credits that occur as a result of the AMT would not be estimated to exceed the number of AMT taxpayers in tax year 2008 for the same period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation as under subparagraph (A).

(4) DURATION OF POLICY ADJUSTMENT.—Adjustments made pursuant to this subsection are available for policies affecting the AMT through only December 31, 2011. Any adjustments shall include budgetary effects in all years from these policy changes.

(f) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF MIDDLE-CLASS TAX CUTS.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Legislation that includes provisions extending middle-class tax cuts shall trigger the current policy adjustment required by this title if those provisions extend 1 or more of the following provisions:

(A) The 10 percent bracket as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under section 101(a) of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(B) The child tax credit as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under section 201 of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(C) Tax benefits for married couples as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under title III of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(D) The adoption credit as in effect in tax year 2010, as provided for under section 202 of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(E) The dependent care credit as in effect in tax year 2010, as provided for under section 204 of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(F) The employer-provided child care credit as in effect in tax year 2010, as provided for under section 205 of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(G) The education tax benefits as in effect in tax year 2010, as provided for under title IV of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(H) The 25 and 28 percent brackets as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under section 101(a) of EGTRRA and any later amendments through December 31, 2009.

(I) The 33 percent bracket as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under section 101(a) of EGTRRA and any later amendment through December 31, 2009, affecting taxpayers with adjusted gross income of $200,000 or less for single filers and $250,000 or less for joint filers in tax year 2010, with these income levels indexed for inflation in each subsequent year consistent with subsection (g).

(J) The rates on income derived from capital gains and qualified dividends as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under sections 301 and 302 of JGTRRA and any later amendment through December 31, 2009, affecting taxpayers with adjusted gross income of $200,000 or less for single filers and $250,000 for joint filers with these income levels indexed for inflation in each subsequent year consistent with subsection (g).

(K) The phaseout of personal exemptions and the overall limitation on itemized deductions as in effect for tax year 2010, as provided for under sections 102 and 103 of EGTRRA of 2001, respectively, and any later amendment through December 31, 2009, affecting taxpayer with adjusted gross income of $200,000 or less for single filers and $250,000 for joint filers, with these income levels indexed for inflation in each subsequent year consistent with subsection (g).

(L) The increase in the limitations on expensing depreciable business assets for small businesses under section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect in tax year 2010, as provided under section 202 of JGTRRA and any later amendment through December 31, 2009.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the maximum current policy adjustment shall be the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected and outlays to be paid under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect); and

(B) what those revenue collections and outlay payments would have been if, on the date of enactment of legislation meeting the criteria in paragraph (1), the provisions identified in paragraph (1) were made permanent.

(3) LIMITATION.—If the provisions in the legislation that cause it to meet the criteria in paragraph (1) are not permanent, subject to the maximum adjustment provided for under paragraph (2), the amount of each current policy adjustment made pursuant to this section shall be limited to the difference between—

(A) total revenues projected to be collected and outlays to be paid under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as scheduled on December 31, 2009, to be in effect for the period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation); and

(B) what those revenue collections and outlay payments would have been if, on the date of enactment of legislation meeting the criteria in paragraph (1), the provisions identified in paragraph (1) had been in effect, without change, for the same period of time covered by the relevant provisions of the eligible legislation as under subparagraph (A).

(g) INDEXING FOR INFLATION.—Indexed amounts are assumed to increase in each year by an amount equal to the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting "calendar year 2008" for "calendar year 1992" in subparagraph (B) of such section.

(h) GUIDANCE ON ESTIMATES AND CURRENT POLICY ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS.—For purposes of estimates made pursuant to subsection (f)—

(A) each of the income tax provisions shall be estimated as though the AMT had remained at current law as scheduled on December 31, 2009 to be in effect; and

(B) if more than 1 of the income tax provisions is included in a single piece of legislation, those provisions shall be estimated in the order in which they appear.

(2) AMT.—For purposes of estimates made pursuant to subsection (e), changes to the AMT shall be estimated as if, on the date of enactment of legislation meeting the criteria in subsection (e)(1), all of the income tax provisions identified in subsection (f)(1) were made permanent.

SEC. 8. APPLICATION OF BBEDCA.

For purposes of this title—

(1) notwithstanding section 275 of BBEDCA, the provisions of sections 255, 256, 257, and 274 of BBEDCA, as amended by this title, shall apply to the provisions of this title;

(2) references in sections 255, 256, 257, and 274 to "this part" or "this title" shall be interpreted as applying to this title;

(3) references in sections 255, 256, 257, and 274 of BBEDCA to "section 254" shall be interpreted as referencing section 5 of this title;

(4) the reference in section 256(b) of BBEDCA to "section 252 or 253" shall be interpreted as referencing section 5 of this title;

(5) the reference in section 256(d)(1) of BBEDCA to "section 252 or 253" shall be interpreted as referencing section 6 of this title;

(6) the reference in section 256(d)(4) of BBEDCA to "section 252 or 253" shall be interpreted as referencing section 5 of this title;

(7) section 256(k) of BBEDCA shall apply to a sequestration, if any, under this title; and

(8) references in section 257(e) of BBEDCA to "section 251, 252, or 253" shall be interpreted as referencing section 4 of this title.

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 250(c)(18) of BBEDCA is amended by striking "the expenses the Federal deposit insurance agencies" and inserting "the expenses of the Federal deposit insurance agencies".

(b) Section 256(k)(1) of BBEDCA is amended by striking "in paragraph (5)" and inserting "in paragraph (6)".

SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 256(a) of BBEDCA is repealed.

(b) Section 256(b) of BBEDCA is amended by striking "origination fees under sections 438(c)(2) and 455(c) of that Act shall each be increased by 0.50 percentage point." and inserting in lieu thereof "origination fees under sections 438(c)(2) and (6) and 455(c) and loan processing and issuance fees under section 428(f)(1)(A)(ii) of that Act shall each be increased by the uniform percentage specified in that sequestration order, and, for student loans originated during the period of the sequestration, special allowance payments under section 438(b) of that Act accruing during the period of the sequestration shall be reduced by the uniform percentage specified in that sequestration order.".

(c) Section 256(c) of BBEDCA is repealed.

(d) Section 256(d) of BBEDCA is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (5), and (6);

(2) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) CALCULATION OF REDUCTION IN PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—To achieve the total percentage reduction in those programs required by section 252 or 253, subject to paragraph (2), and notwithstanding section 710 of the Social Security Act, OMB shall determine, and the applicable

Presidential order under section 254 shall implement, the percentage reduction that shall apply, with respect to the health insurance programs under title XVIII of the Social Security Act—

''(A) in the case of parts A and B of such title, to individual payments for services furnished during the one-year period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning after the date the order is issued (or, if later, the date specified in paragraph (4)); and

''(B) in the case of parts C and D, to monthly payments under contracts under such parts for the same one-year period;

such that the reduction made in payments under that order shall achieve the required total percentage reduction in those payments for that period.''.

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) UNIFORM REDUCTION RATE; MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE REDUCTION.—Reductions in payments for programs and activities under such title XVIII pursuant to a sequestration order under section 254 shall be at a uniform rate, which shall not exceed 4 percent, across all such programs and activities subject to such order.'';

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

''(4) TIMING OF SUBSEQUENT SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—A sequestration order required by section 252 or 253 with respect to programs under such title XVIII shall not take effect until the first month beginning after the end of the effective period of any prior sequestration order with respect to such programs, as determined in accordance with paragraph (1).'';

(5) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, to read as follows:

''(6) SEQUESTRATION DISREGARDED IN COMPUTING PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not take into account any reductions in payment amounts which have been or may be effected under this part, for purposes of computing any adjustments to payment rates under such title XVIII, specifically including—

''(A) the part C growth percentage under section 1853(c)(6);

''(B) the part D annual growth rate under section 1860D–2(b)(6); and

''(C) application of risk corridors to part D payment rates under section 1860D–15(e).''; and

(6) by adding after paragraph (6), as redesignated, the following:

''(7) EXEMPTIONS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—In addition to the programs and activities specified in section 255, the following shall be exempt from sequestration under this part:

''(A) PART D LOW-INCOME SUBSIDIES.—Premium and cost-sharing subsidies under section 1860D–14 of the Social Security Act.

''(B) PART D CATASTROPHIC SUBSIDY.—Payments under section 1860D–15(b) and (e)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act.

''(C) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL (QI) PREMIUMS.—Payments to States for coverage of Medicare cost-sharing for certain low-income Medicare beneficiaries under section 1933 of the Social Security Act.''.

SEC. 11. EXEMPT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 255 of BBEDCA is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as (j) and striking ''1998'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2010''.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY, VETERANS PROGRAMS, NET INTEREST, AND TAX CREDITS.—Subsections (a) through (d) of section 255 of BBEDCA are amended to read as follows:

''(a) SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND TIER I RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—Benefits payable under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and benefits payable under section 231b(a), 231b(f)(2), 231c(a), and 231c(f) of title 45 United States Code, shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part.

''(b) VETERANS PROGRAMS.—The following programs shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part:

''All programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

''Special Benefits for Certain World War II Veterans (28–0401–0–1–701).

''(c) NET INTEREST.—No reduction of payments for net interest (all of major functional category 900) shall be made under any order issued under this part.

''(d) REFUNDABLE INCOME TAX CREDITS.—Payments to individuals made pursuant to provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 establishing refundable tax credits shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part.''.

(c) OTHER PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES, LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS, AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAMS.—Subsections (g) and (h) of section 255 of BBEDCA are amended to read as follows:

''(g) OTHER PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—

''(1)(A) The following budget accounts and activities shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part:

''Activities resulting from private donations, bequests, or voluntary contributions to the Government.

''Activities financed by voluntary payments to the Government for goods or services to be provided for such payments.

''Administration of Territories, Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grants (14–0412–0–1–808).

''Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds (16–0327–0–1–600).

''Black Lung Disability Trust Fund Refinancing (16–0329–0–1–601).

''Bonneville Power Administration Fund and borrowing authority established pursuant to section 13 of Public Law 93–454 (1974), as amended (89–4045–0–3–271).

''Claims, Judgments, and Relief Acts (20–1895–0–1–808).

''Compact of Free Association (14–0415–0–1–808).

''Compensation of the President (11–0209–01–1–802).

''Comptroller of the Currency, Assessment Funds (20–8413–0–8–373).

''Continuing Fund, Southeastern Power Administration (89–5653–0–2–271).

''Continuing Fund, Southwestern Power Administration (89–5649–0–2–271).

''Dual Benefits Payments Account (60–0111–0–1–601).

''Emergency Fund, Western Area Power Administration (89–5069–0–2–271).

''Exchange Stabilization Fund (20–4444–0–3–155).

''Farm Credit Administration Operating Expenses Fund (78–4131–0–3–351).

''Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, Farm Credit Insurance Fund (78–4171–0–3–351).

''Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Deposit Insurance Fund (51–4596–0–4–373).

''Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, FSLIC Resolution Fund (51–4065–0–3–373).

''Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Noninterest Bearing Transaction Account Guarantee (51–4458–0–3–373).

''Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Senior Unsecured Debt Guarantee (51–4457–0–3–373).

''Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

''Federal Housing Finance Agency, Administrative Expenses (95–5532–0–2–371).

''Federal National Mortgage Corporation (Fannie Mae).

''Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund (20–1713–0–1–752).

''Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Pension Fund (20–1714–0–1–601).

''Federal Payments to the Railroad Retirement Accounts (60–0113–0–1–601).

''Federal Reserve Bank Reimbursement Fund (20–1884–0–1–803).

''Financial Agent Services (20–1802–0–1–803).

''Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund (11–8242–0–7–155).

''Hazardous Waste Management, Conservation Reserve Program (12–4336–0–3–999).

''Host Nation Support Fund for Relocation (97–8337–0–7–051).

''Internal Revenue Collections for Puerto Rico (20–5737–0–2–806).

''Intragovernmental funds, including those from which the outlays are derived primarily from resources paid in from other government accounts, except to the extent such funds are augmented by direct appropriations for the fiscal year during which an order is in effect.

''Medical Facilities Guarantee and Loan Fund (75–9931–0–3–551).

''National Credit Union Administration, Central Liquidity Facility (25–4470–0–3–373).

''National Credit Union Administration, Corporate Credit Union Share Guarantee Program (25–4476–0–3–376).

''National Credit Union Administration, Credit Union Homeowners Affordability Relief Program (25–4473–0–3–371).

''National Credit Union Administration, Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (25–4468–0–3–373).

''National Credit Union Administration, Credit Union System Investment Program (25–4474–0–3–376).

''National Credit Union Administration, Operating fund (25–4056–0–3–373).

''National Credit Union Administration, Share Insurance Fund Corporate Debt Guarantee Program (25–4469–0–3–376).

''National Credit Union Administration, U.S. Central Federal Credit Union Capital Program (25–4475–0–3–376).

''Office of Thrift Supervision (20–4108–0–3–373).

''Panama Canal Commission Compensation Fund (16–5155–0–2–602).

''Payment of Vietnam and USS Pueblo prisoner-of-war claims within the Salaries and Expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement account (15–0100–0–1–153).

''Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (24–0200–0–1–805).

''Payment to Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (97–0850–0–1–054).

''Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds (10–0941–0–1–752).

''Payment to Military Retirement Fund (97–0040–0–1–054).

''Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund (19–0540–0–1–153).

''Payments to Copyright Owners (03–5175–0–2–376).

''Payments to Health Care Trust Funds (75–0580–0–1–571).

''Payment to Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund (15–0333–0–1–054).

''Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28–0404–0–1–651).

''Payments to the United States Territories, Fiscal Assistance (14–0418–0–1–806).

''Payments to trust funds from excise taxes or other receipts properly creditable to such trust funds.

''Payments to widows and heirs of deceased Members of Congress (00–0215–0–1–801).

''Postal Service Fund (18–4020–0–3–372).

''Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund (15–8116–0–1–054).

''Reimbursement to Federal Reserve Banks (20–0562–0–1–803).

''Salaries of Article III judges.

''Soldiers and Airmen's Home, payment of claims (84–8930–0–7–705).

''Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, except nonpower programs and activities (64–4110–0–3–999).

''Tribal and Indian trust accounts within the Department of the Interior which fund prior legal obligations of the Government or which are established pursuant to Acts of Congress regarding Federal management of tribal real property or other fiduciary responsibilities, including

but not limited to Tribal Special Fund (14–5265–0–2–452), Tribal Trust Fund (14–8030–0–7–452), White Earth Settlement (14–2204–0–1–452), and Indian Water Rights and Habitat Acquisition (14–5505–0–2–303).

''United Mine Workers of America 1992 Benefit Plan (95–8260–0–7–551).

''United Mine Workers of America 1993 Benefit Plan (95–8535–0–7–551).

''United Mine Workers of America Combined Benefit Fund (95–8295–0–7–551).

''United States Enrichment Corporation Fund (95–4054–0–3–271).

''Universal Service Fund (27–5183–0–2–376).

''Vaccine Injury Compensation (75–0320–0–1–551).

''Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund (20–8175–0–7–551).

''(B) The following Federal retirement and disability accounts and activities shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part:

''Black Lung Disability Trust Fund (20–8144–0–7–601).

''Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund (56–3400–0–1–054).

''Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (24–8135–0–7–602).

''Comptrollers general retirement system (05–0107–0–1–801).

''Contributions to U.S. Park Police annuity benefits, Other Permanent Appropriations (14–9924–0–2–303).

''Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims Retirement Fund (95–8290–0–7–705).

''Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (97–5472–0–2–551).

''District of Columbia Federal Pension Fund (20–5511–0–2–601).

''District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund (20–8212–0–7–602).

''Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Fund (16–1523–0–1–053).

''Foreign National Employees Separation Pay (97–8165–0–7–051).

''Foreign Service National Defined Contributions Retirement Fund (19–5497–0–2–602).

''Foreign Service National Separation Liability Trust Fund (19–8340–0–7–602).

''Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund (19–8186–0–7–602).

''Government Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits (24–0206–0–1–551).

''Government Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance (24–0500–0–1–602).

''Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund (10–8122–0–7–602).

''Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund (10–8110–0–7–602).

''Military Retirement Fund (97–8097–0–7–602).

''National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust (60–8118–0–7–601).

''National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration retirement (13–1450–0–1–306).

''Pensions for former Presidents (47–0105–0–1–802).

''Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund (24–5391–0–2–551).

''Public Safety Officer Benefits (15–0403–0–1–754).

''Rail Industry Pension Fund (60–8011–0–7–601).

''Retired Pay, Coast Guard (70–0602–0–1–403).

''Retirement Pay and Medical Benefits for Commissioned Officers, Public Health Service (75–0379–0–1–551).

''Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners (16–0169–0–1–601).

''Special Benefits, Federal Employees' Compensation Act (16–1521–0–1–600).

''Special Workers Compensation Expenses (16–9971–0–7–601).

''Tax Court Judges Survivors Annuity Fund (23–8115–0–7–602).

''United States Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement Fund (10–8124–0–7–602).

''United States Secret Service, DC Annuity (70–0400–0–1–751).

''Voluntary Separation Incentive Fund (97–8335–0–7–051).

''(2) Prior legal obligations of the Government in the following budget accounts and activities shall be exempt from any order issued under this part:

''Biomass Energy Development (20–0114–0–1–271).

''Check Forgery Insurance Fund (20–4109–0–3–803).

''Credit liquidating accounts.

''Credit reestimates.

''Employees Life Insurance Fund (24–8424–0–8–602).

''Federal Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (69–4120–0–3–402).

''Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund (12–4085–0–3–351).

''Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Insurance Fund (58–4236–0–3–453).

''Geothermal resources development fund (89–0206–0–1–271).

''Low-Rent Public Housing—Loans and Other Expenses (86–4098–0–3–604).

''Maritime Administration, War Risk Insurance Revolving Fund (69–4302–0–3–403).

''Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund (14–1618–0–1–302).

''Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Noncredit Account (71–4184–0–3–151).

''Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation Fund (16–4204–0–3–601).

''San Joaquin Restoration Fund (14–5537–0–2–301).

''Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Fund (36–4009–0–3–701).

''Terrorism Insurance Program (20–0123–0–1–376).

''(h) LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS.—The following programs shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part:

''Academic Competitiveness/Smart Grant Program (91–0205–0–1–502).

''Child Care Entitlement to States (75–1550–0–1–609).

''Child Enrollment Contingency Fund (75–5551–0–2–551).

''Child Nutrition Programs (with the exception of special milk programs) (12–3539–0–1–605).

''Children's Health Insurance Fund (75–0515–0–1–551).

''Commodity Supplemental Food Program (12–3507–0–1–605).

''Contingency Fund (75–1522–0–1–609).

''Family Support Programs (75–1501–0–1–609).

''Federal Pell Grants under section 401 Title IV of the Higher Education Act.

''Grants to States for Medicaid (75–0512–0–1–551).

''Payments for Foster Care and Permanency (75–1545–0–1–609).

''Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (12–3505–0–1–605).

''Supplemental Security Income Program (28–0406–0–1–609).

''Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (75–1552–0–1–609).''.

(d) ADDITIONAL EXCLUDED PROGRAMS.—Section 255 of BBEDCA is amended by adding the following after subsection (h):

''(i) ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAMS.—The following programs shall be exempt from reduction under any order issued under this part:

''GSE Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements (20–0125–0–1–371).

''Office of Financial Stability (20–0128–0–1–376).

''Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program (20–0133–0–1–376).

''(j) SPLIT TREATMENT PROGRAMS.—Each of the following programs shall be exempt from any order under this part to the extent that the budgetary resources of such programs are subject to obligation limitations in appropriations bills:

''Federal-Aid Highways (69–8083–0–7–401).

''Highway Traffic Safety Grants (69–8020–0–7–401).

''Operations and Research NHTSA and National Driver Register (69–8016–0–7–401).

''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (69–8159–0–7–401).

''Motor Carrier Safety Grants (69–8158–0–7–401).

''Formula and Bus Grants (69–8350–0–7–401).

''Grants-In-Aid for Airports (69–8106–0–7–402).''.

SEC. 12. DETERMINATIONS AND POINTS OF ORDER.

Nothing in this title shall be construed as limiting the authority of the chairmen of the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate under section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. CBO may consult with the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees to resolve any ambiguities in this title.

SEC. 13. LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

(a) LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution pursuant to any expedited procedure to consider the recommendations of a Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action or other commission that contains recommendations with respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act, or the taxes received under subchapter A of chapter 9; the taxes imposed by subchapter E of chapter 1; and the taxes collected under section 86 of part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE AND WASTEFUL SPENDING

SEC. 21. IDENTIFICATION, CONSOLIDATION, AND ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

The Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office shall conduct routine investigations to identify programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives with duplicative goals and activities within Departments and government-wide and report annually to Congress on the findings, including the cost of such duplication and with recommendations for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication identifying specific rescissions.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will control 30 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) will control 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Speaker, and I yield myself 1 minute.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, as we have on numerous occasions, we just raised the liability, or the ability, of the United States to pay a substantial amount. What we are doing now that we have not done in the last decade is to adopt a fiscal constraint at the same time, a fiscal constraint to get us to wherever Americans want us to be, and that is to fiscal balance, to a fiscally responsible government and a fiscally responsible country to match the fiscal responsibility of most of our citizens.

The House has just voted that our country should pay the bills it already incurred. Those obligations, of course, come from actions America has already taken. Those actions cannot be changed, so it was necessary to pay the bill. But we can and must confront our record debt going forward. We can and must set a more responsible path fiscally for our country.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

A New York Times analysis found that 90 percent of our deficit is due to the policies of the previous administration, the extension of those policies, and the economic downturn. However we believe America got into this mess, this Congress can begin getting America out of it. That is why Congress must pass one of the most proven deficit cutting tools we know, statutory pay-as-you-go legislation or, as it is affectionately known, PAYGO.

Now, let me point out this chart to my right, your left. The deficits are when we did not have statutory PAYGO in effect. Now, when statutory PAYGO was put into effect in 1990, we still had deficits, but you can see that we started reducing those deficits almost on a straight line. And then in 1997 we went into surplus, fiscal year 1998, and we went into surplus for the next 4 years under PAYGO. Unfortunately, you will see that in 2001 it was decided that we would waive PAYGO, and then in 2003 it was decided by the then majority party that we would eliminate statutory PAYGO. And you can see the result. We returned to deep deficits.

So what we are voting on on the floor has demonstrably made a difference, has demonstrably helped America discipline its finances and bring surpluses. As I said, when George Bush took office from President Clinton, he, his administration, based upon the past record of the Clinton administration, said we had a $5.6 trillion surplus. Unfortunately, for the country, when President Bush left office we had an almost $8 trillion deficit confronting us.

PAYGO compels Congress to find savings for the money it spends, so it keeps our deficit from increasing. Under PAYGO we'll be required to find savings to balance any new tax cuts or entitlement spending, which makes this law essential, essential to the wise prioritization that responsible budgeting demands and, indeed, that our fellow citizens expect. As the Concord Coalition, a bipartisan fiscal responsibility group, put it, and I quote, ''PAYGO requires anyone proposing tax cuts or entitlement expansions to answer the question, How do you pay for it? Going through this process will force an explicit trade-off between spending, taxes and debt, which is exactly the priority-setting exercise that the budget process should and must facilitate.'' We all know that such deliberate priority-setting steps stops us from passing our bills on to our children.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Under President Clinton, PAYGO helped turn record deficits into a $5.6 trillion projected surplus. We also know that PAYGO was disregarded, waived and finally allowed to expire under the last administration. And as I have pointed out on this chart, our deficits exploded and, indeed, our economy was hurt as well as those deficits exploded. Some argue that the PAYGO legislation on the floor today is too weak. But I'd point out that it brings our country more fiscal discipline than it has seen in nearly a decade.

The perfect ought not to be the enemy of the good. PAYGO can't get us out of our fiscal hole, but it can keep us from digging it deeper. When my Republican colleagues raise their concerns about our growing debt, I absolutely agree with them. They're right. All of us understand this debt is not sustainable. But it's not enough to complain about the debt; we have to do something about it. If my colleagues are sincere in their concerns, I hope they'll work with us to pass PAYGO and contribute to the bipartisan fiscal commission announced by President Obama. I hope you'll participate in that commission, helping us get our country to fiscal balance.

America's dangerous fiscal condition threatens our prosperity and our place in the world. If my colleagues will forgive a Democrat for paraphrasing Ronald Reagan, there are no easy answers to this mess, but there is a simple answer. The answer lies in recommitting ourselves to the principle that has served our prosperity so well in the past, the principle of responsibility. Ronald Reagan was right. Let us pass this legislation.

In closing, let me say, Madam Speaker, that so many people are responsible for this day; the Blue Dogs, I want to congratulate them. In a minute I'm going to yield to ALLEN BOYD who has led this effort on behalf of the Blue Dogs for such a long and successful time.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

I also want to congratulate an extraordinary individual who worked for an individual who's not on this floor, Charlie Stenholm, who deserves a portion of the credit this day for this legislation. And he was assisted, as I am now assisted, as all of the House is assisted, by an extraordinary member of our staff, Ed Lorenzen. Ed, I want to thank you personally for the extraordinary efforts you have made to get us to this day.

Madam Speaker, I designate Mr. BOYD of Florida to control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If this so-called PAYGO legislation fails, there is no increase in the debt limit and you cannot separate the two concepts. If this legislation passes, the debt limit increases by an astounding $1.9 trillion, the largest one-time increase in the debt limit ever. Since the majority came into control of Congress 3 years ago, the debt limit has been increased by over $5.3 trillion, or by nearly 60 percent. Despite this massive heap of debt thrust on the American people, Democrats plan to pile on even more debt next year.

According to the President's newest budget proposal, the amount of debt subject to the limit will increase by nearly $1.4 trillion from fiscal year 2010 to fiscal year 2011. A number that large is hard to put into perspective, but let me offer a few points of reference. The President intends to increase the debt in just 1 year by an amount equal to the entire GDP of Canada. This 1-year increase in the debt is larger than the GDP of India, Mexico, Australia, or South Korea. It is larger than the GDP of Ireland, Poland, and Belgium combined. We've heard a lot of talk recently from the President about the need to get America's fiscal house in order. However, according to the President's own budget, Congress will have to raise the debt limit again before 2011 is over.

□ 1415

Even more disturbing is the fact that under the President's proposed budget, debts subject to this limit will exceed the size of the entire U.S. economy by 2013 and remain more than U.S. GDP through the next decade and presumably for years to come.

Experts on both sides of the political spectrum agree that this kind of runaway debt threatens the very foundation of America's economy. Yesterday, the market provided a stark warning as credit rating agency Moody's stated the U.S. AAA bond rating is threatened by deficits driving up this debt.

I hear a lot from the President, from my colleagues in the majority, about inherited deficits and debt, but let's be clear. According to the President's own budget, the largest deficit in U.S. history will be under a Democratic administration and a Democratic majority in

Congress. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress plan a 1-year increase in the debt larger than the size of major economies around the world.

This isn't about what anyone inherited. It is about what this President and the Democrats in Congress planned for America: too much spending, too much taxing, and too much debt.

My friends on the other side are fond of the analogy that raising the debt limit is necessary in the same way that someone who has eaten in a restaurant must now pay the bill. That analogy is misleading. It is more accurate to say that having sat down at a restaurant with enough money for a decent meal, Democrats decided to go on an eating binge. It's simply irresponsible for Democrats to spend the American people's money in this fashion.

Rather than letting this massive debt increase pass, I urge Congress to examine its out-of-control spending habit this year rather than after the election, as the President suggests with his so-called deficit commission.

I urge this House to restore responsible spending. Vote ''no'' on the largest one-time increase in the debt limit ever.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I rise in favor of this PAYGO legislation. This has been a priority of mine and my Blue Dog colleagues for many, many years, and I am proud to stand here today where we're on the brink of final passage of this very important legislation.

Madam Speaker, PAYGO was the very first bill that President Obama sent to Congress last year, and the progress we made in the last year would not be possible without his support. And I want to thank the President for weighing in and supporting fiscal responsibility.

I also want to take a moment to thank the leaders of the House who have been so important, particularly Speaker NANCY PELOSI, who has a commitment to fiscal responsibility, Majority Leader STENY HOYER, who you've already heard from, and also chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN SPRATT.

My Blue Dog colleagues and I will continue to advocate for tools to bring our fiscal house in order because this is only the very first step. It is a small step, and it will not solve all of our problems that have been created over the last decade, but we will continue to advocate for tools that will pave the way for long-term economic stability.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. These congressional Democrats just aren't listening. After Massachusetts, voters sent a signal on behalf of this country of no more spending, we are too deep in debt, a here-we-go-again. And when they sent the signal that government should be open and the people ought to have a say today, they snuck into this bill an increase in the debt limit to make sure there wouldn't be an embarrassing up-or-down vote on this bill the way the public demands it to be.

When they were in charge, it was a different story. As the majority leader, highly respected STENY HOYER, said, Democrats, raising the debt limit is immoral. This policy of borrow and spend is not only irresponsible, it's immoral and it must stop. He was exactly right.

When our Speaker—again, highly respected Speaker—took that gavel 3 years ago, the debt limit in America was $29,000 for every man, woman, and child. Today, just 3 years later, it's $45,000 for each one of you, and it's going up and up and up each year.

And I will tell you, when they say, No, no, the Republicans, Democrats share the blame, Democrats have incurred twice as much of that debt to date, and it's going to skyrocket under their control. And what's even more frustrating is, with the new President's budget, that deficit is going to triple over future years.

And I will finish with this. PAYGO. PAYGO is to fiscal responsibility what ethics is to the former Governor of Illinois, Mr. Blagojevich. PAYGO, since it's been put in place 3 years ago, our deficits have increased tenfold.

I urge defeat of this bill.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to yield 2½ minutes to the Budget Committee chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, to supplement my remarks about statutory PAYGO, I would like to include in the RECORD the attached section of the bill.

Madam Speaker, at the outset of the 1990s, the Congress passed the Budget Enforcement Act for a simple purpose: to ensure that the Budget Summit Agreement we just passed was actually carried out. Among its provisions was a new rule called PAYGO, pay-as-you-go.

I can remember how our critics disdained our resort to budget process instead of making hard substantive decisions. They said we were dodging the hard choices, choices we had to make if we were going to wipe out the deficit. But by the end of the 1990s, the budget was in surplus for the first time in 30 years, and it was clear that for the budget process, rules we would put in place like PAYGO played a big part in our fiscal success.

Republicans were in the majority in 2002 when the Budget Enforcement Act expired, and they chose not to reinstate PAYGO because they knew it would impede passage of their tax-cutting agenda. Without these process rules in place, the budget plunged from a surplus of $236 billion to a deficit of $413 billion in the year 2004. When Democrats took back the House, we made PAYGO a rule of the House the first day we convened the 110th Congress.

The Obama administration, the current Congress have inherited an economy in crisis and a colossal deficit, swollen by recession and recovery measures both. As these measures pull us out of recession, we should turn our attention on our longer-term fiscal fate.

Statutory PAYGO works. It's proven to work. It reins in new entitlement spending. It reins in tax cuts as well. Both tend to be long lasting, easy to pass, hard to repeal. By insisting on offsets and insisting on deficit neutrality, PAYGO buffers the bottom line, and Lord knows it needs it now. Its terms are complex, but at its core is a commonsense rule that everyone can understand: When you are in a hole, stop digging.

Statutory PAYGO was first put in place with bipartisan support, renewed on a bipartisan basis in 1997. When the House passed it in July, the rule PAYGO, two dozen Republicans joined 241 Democrats in voting for it.

We recall and invite you to cast another vote today for statutory for fiscal responsibility. Vote for statutory PAYGO. It will help us reduce the deficit, both short-term and long-term. And while it can't solve all of our problems—it's no panacea—it does represent one solid step forward towards getting things back on the path of fiscal sustainability and fiscal responsibility.

Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the Budget Committee I am submitting for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 that the House is considering today as part of the Senate amendments to H.J. Res. 45. The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes points of order in the House of Representatives only to the extent that it does so explicitly.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2010

Section 1—Short Title: The title of this Act is the ''Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.''

Section 2—Purpose: The purpose of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act (PAYGO) of 2010 is to reestablish a statutory procedure to enforce a rule of budget neutrality on new revenue and direct spending legislation.

Section 3—Definitions and Applications: Section 3 sets forth definitions of terms used in the PAYGO statute. Many terms are defined by cross-references to the standard definitions used in other budget laws, including the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (BBEDCA) of 1985. Terms that are of particular importance include:

Budgetary effects. Budgetary effects are defined as the amount by which PAYGO legislation changes mandatory outlays or revenues relative to the baseline. The budgetary effects of changes in tax or mandatory spending law are measured relative to what revenues or mandatory spending would otherwise have been if not for the legislation, as measured by the baseline (as defined in section 257 of BBEDCA). Off-budget effects (i.e., Social Security trust funds and the Postal Service fund) and debt service are not counted as budgetary effects. ''Mandatory spending'' and ''direct spending'' (the term used in the statutory language) are synonymous.

PAYGO legislation/PAYGO Act. Legislation, or provisions thereof, that increases or reduces revenues, or increases or reduces the cost of mandatory programs, is called PAYGO legislation or a PAYGO Act. In this Act, the terms are used interchangeably. PAYGO legislation is subject to statutory PAYGO.

Legislation subject to PAYGO also includes provisions in annual appropriations bills that change revenue or mandatory spending law in appropriations bills. Changes in mandatory spending law are considered discretionary in the current and budget years because the Appropriations Committees can offset the costs or use the savings by adjusting funding levels for discretionary programs in those years. But mandatory spending provisions in appropriations bills having outyear budget authority effects—that is, effects in those years after the budget year—are considered PAYGO legislation. This is generally consistent with the existing point of order in the Senate against ChIMPs (Changes in Mandatory Programs). However, such provisions for which the mandatory outlay effects net to zero over the period consisting of the current year, the budget year, and the four subsequent years shall not be counted as having budgetary effects.

Timing shift. A timing shift involves a shift of costs from within the PAYGO window, i.e., the ten-year period covered by the PAYGO scorecard, to outside the window (or savings from outside the window to within the window). More technically, the term is defined to refer to a delay of the date on which mandatory outlays would otherwise occur from the ninth outyear (the last year taken into account in the PAYGO calculation) to the tenth outyear (not taken into account in the PAYGO calculation) or an acceleration of the date on which revenues or offsetting receipts or collections would otherwise occur from the tenth outyear to the ninth outyear. Timing shifts are not counted for purposes of statutory PAYGO to prevent gaming the PAYGO scorecard.

Section 4—PAYGO Estimates and PAYGO Scorecards: Section 4 establishes procedures for determining the budgetary effects of legislation subject to PAYGO. These budgetary effects are entered by OMB on the PAYGO scorecards, as defined in section 4(d), and are used to determine whether a sequestration order must be issued.

Estimates of budgetary effects are made either by Congress or OMB. Subsection (a) establishes the procedures Congress must follow in order for its estimate of budgetary effects of legislation to be used for PAYGO enforcement. If Congress follows these procedures, the Congressional estimate of budgetary effects shall be used by OMB. If Congress does not follow these procedures, the budgetary effects of legislation subject to PAYGO shall be estimated by OMB. Subsection (b) establishes the procedures by which the House and Senate Budget Committees obtain estimates from CBO, and the procedures to be used by CBO for making estimates. Subsection (c) outlines the additional procedures to be followed by CBO or OMB, as applicable, when adjusting the estimates of budgetary effects for legislation that qualifies for a ''current policy'' adjustment under section 7 of this Act. Subsections (d)–(f) relate to procedures used by OMB for PAYGO estimates and enforcement. Subsection (g) addresses procedures for legislation designated as an emergency for the purpose of statutory PAYGO.

The Chairmen of the Budget Committees in each House are authorized to submit estimates of budgetary effects for printing in the Congressional Record. If such estimates are submitted, they shall establish the budgetary effects of the legislation as described below. Printing the statement in the Congressional Record ensures that the estimate of budgetary effects is, at the time of the vote on the bill that is enacted into law, unambiguous, fixed, and knowable, for Members, for OMB, and for the public.

(a) PAYGO Estimates. Congress can establish the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation by following a two-step process. First, the text of PAYGO legislation must include one of the statements prescribed in paragraphs (1)(A), (B), or (C). Second, the Chairman of the relevant Budget Committee must submit for printing in the Congressional Record a statement of the budgetary effects of the legislation, also referred to as the ''cost estimate'' or ''score.'' A Congressional estimate must satisfy both of these requirements to be valid. If Congress fails to follow this procedure for legislation that is subsequently enrolled and signed by the President, or chooses not to provide an estimate of budgetary effects, the OMB estimate of a PAYGO Act's budgetary effects is used for PAYGO enforcement.

The statements prescribed in paragraphs (1)(A), (B), or (C) establish a reference in the legislative text of PAYGO legislation to an estimate of budgetary effects to be submitted for printing in the Congressional Report before a vote on passage. The statement may be included in the original text of the legislation, or by amendment as may be allowed under the regular procedures in either House. The estimate need only be submitted for printing in the Congressional Record before a vote on passage. The actual estimate of budgetary effects is never inserted into the legislative text of PAYGO legislation. This process avoids the need to amend PAYGO legislation to include an updated estimate of budgetary effects if amendments are adopted.

This two-step process avoids the Constitutional concerns identified in *Bowsher v. Synar*, 479 U.S. 714 (1986) and *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) because Congress will establish the budgetary effects of the PAYGO Act through the legislative process, not after enactment. An unambiguous and fixed estimate available prior to a vote is incorporated by reference in the PAYGO legislation. Matters incorporated by reference are binding on the executive branch. *See Hershey Foods v. USDA*, 158 F. Supp. 2d 37, 41 (D.D.C. 2001), *aff'd on other grounds,* 293 F.3d 520 (D.C. Cir. 2002); *see also United States v. Sharpnack*, 355 U.S. 286, 293 (1958).

1. Required Designation in PAYGO Acts: One of three statements must be included in legislation subject to PAYGO for the Congressional estimate to be entered by OMB on the PAYGO scorecard. The statements provide the basis in the legislative text for incorporating the Congressional estimate by reference into the PAYGO Act.

The three statements address three possible scenarios under which a PAYGO Act may be signed by the President: (1) legislation is originated by the House and passed without amendment by the Senate; (2) legislation is originated by the Senate and passed without amendment by the House; and (3) legislation is agreed upon by both Houses after differences are resolved by a conference committee or by amendments between the Houses.

Statement (1)(A) refers to an estimate provided by the House Budget Committee Chairman. This statement would be included in legislation originated in the House of Representatives. If the House Budget Committee Chairman submits a statement of budgetary effects for printing in the Congressional Record before the vote on passage in the House, the budgetary effects of that legislation will have been set by the House. If the Senate then passes the House bill without amendment, the House PAYGO estimate will be placed on the PAYGO scorecard by OMB. Similarly, if the Senate originates and passes PAYGO legislation with the statement prescribed 3 in (1)(B), and the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee submits a statement of budgetary effects for printing in the Congressional Record before the Senate votes, the House of Representatives will have accepted the Senate estimate as controlling if it passes the Senate bill without amendment.

One House may strike the statement inserted in the legislative text by the other House and replace it with the statement referring to the estimate submitted by the Chairman of its Budget Committee. In doing so, the second House has rejected the first House's estimate. A disagreement between the Houses on the estimate of budgetary effects becomes a matter in dispute between the Houses to be resolved by the House and Senate Budget Committees.

The statement in (1)(C) refers to an estimate of budgetary effects jointly submitted to the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House and Senate Budget Committees. This statement must be included in a conference report, or amendments between the Houses, when the Houses resolve the differences in their budgetary estimates. Where differences between the Houses are to be resolved in a process of amendments between the Houses, the requirement of a joint statement prevents the House acting first from having an advantage in negotiations. The joint statement also underscores that different estimates of the budgetary effects of legislation must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Chairmen of both Budget Committees if Congress wants a Congressional estimate to be placed on the PAYGO scorecard.

Presumably not all PAYGO legislation will contain a Congressional estimate of budgetary effects. For example, the budgetary effects of a particular PAYGO Act may be so small that Congress chooses not to complete an estimate. It is also possible that the Houses cannot come to an agreement on an estimate of budgetary effects. Absent a designation pursuant to section 4(a)(1) and estimate submitted pursuant to section 4(a)(2), the estimate made by OMB post-enactment will be entered on the PAYGO scorecards.

In some cases, one piece of PAYGO legislation could have multiple designations and estimates throughout the legislative process—the first by the originating House, the second by the second House acting upon the legislation, and a third by the conference committee. For the purpose of directing OMB as to what amounts are to be entered on the PAYGO scorecards, the only estimate that matters is the one contained in the version of the legislation passed by both Houses and presented to the President for signature. Conversely, the omission by one or both Houses of a designation and estimate earlier in the legislative process, for whatever reason, has no bearing on the validity of an otherwise valid estimate appropriately referenced in a PAYGO Act signed by the President.

2. Determination of Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Acts: In order for Congress's estimate of budgetary effects to bind OMB, a

valid statement must be submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by a Chairman of the Budget Committee, or by the Chairmen jointly, as applicable. However, the Chairmen are not obligated to submit a statement. The statement, if submitted, must be titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation.''

The Chairmen of the Budget Committees retain full discretion over the Congressional estimate of budgetary effects for the purposes of enforcing this Act, consistent with Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act. The Congressional Budget Office will continue to provide estimates to the Budget Committees.

It is the responsibility of the Budget Committee Chairmen to ensure that statements of budgetary effects are submitted for the Congressional Record in a timely manner, and that they identify with specificity any previously submitted statement for the same legislation that it supersedes. A previous statement is no longer valid and is superseded when that House adopts an amendment to a PAYGO Act after the statement has been submitted. Any subsequent amendment, regardless of its budgetary effects, will invalidate a previously submitted estimate.

In the case of a conference report, a statement of budgetary effects is not valid if it is first submitted for printing in the Congressional Record after one House passes the report. It is incumbent on both Houses to ensure that prior to a vote in either House on PAYGO legislation leading to enrollment and presentation to the President, there is an unambiguous, fixed, and knowable statement of budgetary effects.

3. Procedure in the Senate: It is in order in the Senate for the Legislative Clerk to read the statement of budgetary effects into the record of proceedings once it has been submitted by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. This reading provides an added assurance that all Senators have been given notice of the Congressional estimate of the budgetary effects prior to a vote on passage of legislation. Notice to Senators will also be provided by printing the estimate in the Congressional Record. As a practical matter, votes on some legislation subject to PAYGO may be taken after the statement has been submitted for the Congressional Record, but before it has been printed. If the vote will be taken after the statement has been printed, the Senate may waive the reading of the estimate by unanimous consent.

4. Jurisdiction of the Budget Committees: When Congress follows the procedure set forth in this section, the designated legislation is not subject to a point of order under section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act. (Section 306 generally bars the consideration of legislation dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee unless it has been reported by the committee, or the committee has been discharged from further consideration.) The inclusion of the statements specified in (1)(A), (B), and (C)—without modification—in legislation subject to PAYGO avoids a point of order under section 306. If different language is used, for example, or if an authorizing committee includes some other budgetary provision, a point of order under section 306 would be in order. This is consistent with Senate precedent that ''directed scoring'' language in legislation is within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committees.

(b) CBO PAYGO Estimates. Subsection (b) amends Section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a procedure by which Congress may request that CBO estimate the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation. Consistent with section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act, and existing Congressional practice and procedure, the Chairmen of the Budget Committees are responsible for requesting estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. CBO shall prepare its estimates consistent with section 257 of BBEDCA, but shall not count timing shifts as those are defined in section 3(8) of this Act. CBO estimates shall also be scored in accordance with the scorekeeping guidelines determined under section 252(d)(5) of BBEDCA.

(c) Current Policy Adjustments for Certain Legislation. Section 4(c) establishes procedures for making adjustments to the estimates of budgetary effects for legislation in four policy areas: (1) physician payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act; (2) the Estate and Gift Tax; (3) the Alternative Minimum Tax; and (4) certain middle class tax cuts provided in EGTRRA and JGTRRA. The criteria for determining whether legislation, or provisions of legislation, qualify for current policy adjustments are set forth in section 7.

1. In General: If the Chairman of either Budget Committee determines that legislation meets the criteria set forth in section 7 of this Act, that Chairman shall request that CBO adjust its estimate of budgetary effects. If OMB estimates the budgetary effects of legislation that meets the criteria of section 7 because Congress has not provided a valid estimate, then OMB shall adjust its estimate of budgetary effects.

2. Adjustments: For qualifying legislation or provisions of legislation, CBO or OMB, as applicable, shall exclude from the estimate of budgetary effects no more than the amount of the budgetary effects of that legislation or provision as allowed in the applicable part of section 7. The amount that may be excluded is determined with reference to the amounts previously excluded pursuant to the same subsection of section 7. In other words, if the cost of a particular provision, when added to the costs or savings of all other provisions that previously qualified for an adjustment under that subsection of section 7 exceeds the maximum amount allowable for the subsection, the excess costs shall not be excluded from the estimate of budgetary effects. In implementing these adjustments, CBO shall use CBO's baseline estimates; this requirement is not intended to apply to estimates prepared by OMB. If CBO makes an adjustment, its estimate shall state the unadjusted and adjusted costs, and an updated total of all costs previously excluded under the same provisions of section 7.

3. Limitation on Availability of Excess Savings: The intent of the current policy adjustment is to give Congress flexibility to extend certain current policies with budgetary effects over specified periods of time. Savings from the extension of current policies with budgetary effects less than allowed under section 7—in other words extensions that generate savings in comparison with the extension of current policy—cannot be used to offset costs of other legislation. This paragraph establishes two rules that reinforce the prohibition on the fungibility of savings relative to the current policy extensions.

A. Excess savings cannot be used to offset the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation that would not otherwise qualify for a current policy exemption under section 7. For example, if Congress were to enact only a one-year fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax, the difference in revenue generated by a two-year and one-year fix of the AMT cannot be used to offset the cost of a new entitlement program.

B. Excess savings in one of the policy areas specified in section 7 cannot be used to offset the budgetary effects of a more expensive policy extension in another policy area. For example, if Congress were to enact only a one-year fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax, the difference in revenue generated by a two-year and one-year fix of the AMT cannot be used to offset a reduction in the estate and gift tax that costs more than is otherwise provided in section 7. In other words, savings among the policies in sections 7(c), (d), (e), and (f), and among the subparagraphs of section 7(f)(1), are not fungible.

4. Further Guidance on Estimating Budgetary Effects: To determine adjustments for the budgetary effects for qualifying legislation, CBO or OMB, as applicable, shall use the conventions concerning the stacking order of estimates of the interactive effects of AMT relief and extension of the middle class tax cuts set forth section 7(h).

5. Inclusion of Statement: Any adjustments for current policy legislation shall be explained by the appropriate Chairman of the Budget Committee in the statement ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' submitted for printing in the Congressional Record.

(d) OMB PAYGO Scorecards. The subsection outlines OMB's responsibilities under statutory PAYGO. OMB will maintain two ''PAYGO scorecards,'' available to the public, that maintain a running tally of the budgetary effects of enacted legislation subject to PAYGO. In making entries onto the scorecards, OMB will use the ''look-back'' and ''averaging'' rules discussed below.

OMB will use the Congressional estimate of the budgetary effects of a PAYGO Act if one was incorporated pursuant to section (4)(a). If not, OMB will enter its own estimates on the scorecards.

The scorekeeping and baseline rules for current policy adjustments are the same as those that apply to CBO and OMB for estimating all legislation subject to PAYGO. OMB estimates must be consistent with the scorekeeping approaches described in section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended by section 4(b) of this Act, and the current policy adjustments in section 7. In other words, OMB and CBO estimates should be made using the same rules and scorekeeping conventions. However, CBO will use the baseline as defined by section 257 of the Congressional Budget Act, while OMB will use the economic and technical assumptions included in the latest budget submitted by the President.

OMB will maintain two PAYGO scorecards, one covering a five-year period and the other covering a ten-year period beginning in the budget year.

OMB shall not include on either PAYGO scorecard any net savings generated by subsequently enacted legislation titled ''Community Living Assistance Services and Supports Act'' (CLASS Act). The CLASS Act was included in the Senate- and House-passed health care reform bills and would establish a federal insurance program for long-term care. OMB shall also not include any net savings generated by subsequent amendments to that Act, if enacted.

(e) Look-Back to Capture Current Year Effects. To take into account any budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation in the current year (i.e., the year of enactment if before October 1st), a ''look-back'' rule is included. The rule provides that budgetary effects in the current year are to be treated as if they were budgetary effects in the budget year (which is the year subsequent to the current year). This is why the averaging provision described below actually sums eleven years of costs (the current year, the budget year, and the nine outyears) and divides the sum by ten. This look-back provision similarly applies to the five-year scorecard.

(f) Averaging Used to Measure Compliance Over 5-Year and 10-Year Periods. For the budget year and the applicable four or nine outyears, OMB is to enter the annual average budgetary effect associated with PAYGO legislation. For instance, a bill that pays for itself over ten years will have a total, and thus average, score of zero, so zero would be entered in each column of the ten-year PAYGO scorecard. If a bill enacted in FY10 costs a net of $10 billion over FY2010–FY2020, OMB would insert +$1 billion in each of the ten columns on the PAYGO ledger (FY11 through FY20). The same PAYGO legislation could well have different averages over five years and over ten. For example, if a bill enacted this session costs $2 billion through 2015 and $10 billion through 2020, the five-year scorecard would record entries of $0.4 billion for each of 2011 through 2015, while the ten-year scorecard would record entries of $1 billion for each of 2011 through 2020.

(g) Emergency Legislation. If legislation subject to PAYGO contains an emergency designation, the budgetary effects of provisions that are designated as emergencies shall not be placed on the PAYGO scorecards by OMB. The designation should refer to subsection (g)(1) of this Act. The procedure for challenging a statutory emergency designation for PAYGO enforcement reflects the current practices for challenging emergency designations under Congressional budget rules. In the Senate, an emergency designation is subject to a point of order that may be waived upon a vote of 3/5 of the members duly chosen and sworn. If the Senate does not waive this point of order, the emergency designation is struck from the legislation. Both this section of this Act and clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives require the Chair to put the question of consideration with respect to a measure containing a provision expressly designated as an emergency for the purposes of pay-as-you-go requirements. As a result of this duplication of nearly identical requirements, the two should be interpreted to merge and thereby require the Chair to put just one question of consideration in satisfaction of both requirements.

Section 5—Annual Report and Sequestration Order: Section 5 defines the timing of the annual PAYGO report and, if one is needed, the sequestration order. OMB is to produce an annual PAYGO report, which shall include up-to-date PAYGO scorecards and a description of any sequestration if required. The report is to be released no more than 14 days (excluding weekends and legal holidays) after Congress adjourns to end a session.

If the annual report shows a debit (i.e., net budgetary cost) on either PAYGO scorecard for the budget year, the President is required to issue an order sequestering budgetary resources from non-exempt mandatory programs sufficient to fully pay off that debit. If it shows a debit on both the five-year and ten-year scorecards, the sequestration must pay off the larger debit. If the President issues this order, then the PAYGO annual report must contain its details, including such information as the outlay reductions that would occur in the budget year and the subsequent fiscal year for each affected account.

Because the PAYGO statute creates a permanent law, the two scorecards are permanent. In effect, they will record all PAYGO legislation enacted from the date the bill becomes law. The cost estimates of individual PAYGO bills, however, will eventually slide off the scorecards since only the five-year or ten-year costs are recorded on those scorecards. For example, a PAYGO bill enacted later this year will show cost or savings entries of the same size (the average amount through 2015) for each fiscal year 2011 through 2015 on the five-year scorecard. Next year, new PAYGO legislation will add entries to the five-year scorecard covering years 2012–2016. The entries made this year in the 2012–2015 columns of that scorecard will remain on that scorecard, however. If those entries are net savings, the savings will be available to cover costs in new legislation, but if they are net debits, avoiding a sequestration at the end of each of the next four sessions of Congress will require that the net debits be worked off by the enactment of new offsetting savings. The same approach applies to the ten-year scorecard.

Section 6—Calculating a Sequestration: Section 6 describes how sequestration is to be implemented if triggered. Many mandatory programs, such as Social Security, veterans' disability and other benefits, and major low-income entitlements, such as Supplemental Security Income and Medicaid, are totally exempt from sequestration. Only programs in the unified budget are subject to sequestration.

With the exception of Medicare, non-exempt mandatory programs would be cut by a uniform percent, such that the outlay savings produced in the budget year and the subsequent fiscal year would be sufficient to fully offset the budget-year debit on the PAYGO ledger. Medicare can be cut by no more than four percent. If a larger cut is needed to offset the debit on the PAYGO ledger, the uniform percentage cut to the other non-exempt mandatory programs would be increased so that the sequester of Medicare and the other non-exempt programs would together produce sufficient savings to offset the budget-year debit. Sequestrations are temporary, not permanent, and with a few exceptions occur only in the budget year.

For most non-exempt mandatory programs, the uniform sequestration percentage reduces budgetary resources by a specified percent over the course of the entire fiscal year. If a sequestration starts a month or more into the fiscal year because Congress adjourns in November or December, then the reduction during the remaining 9, 10, or 11 months of the fiscal year will be larger than the uniform percentage so that the average sequestration over the year equals the required uniform percentage.

In the case of Medicare, the sequestration lasts for a full 12 months even if it takes effect after the beginning of the fiscal year, in which case it will run into the start of the next fiscal year. This means the uniform percentage cut in payments to providers or insurance plans will not be higher at any time than the four-percent limit (or the calculated uniform percentage, if lower).

In the case of price support payments for crops, the sequestration for any given crop will start at the beginning of the next crop year. As a consequence, sequestrations for crops will not all be running concurrently, and some sequestrations may occur partly in the following fiscal year.

Section 7—Adjustments for Certain Current Policies:

(a) Purpose. Section 7 establishes a temporary rule to adjust the estimates of the budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation in four policy areas: Medicare physician payments, the estate tax, the Alternative Minimum Tax, and the 2001 and 2003 income tax cuts for the middle class. In each of these areas, current policies have either expired at the end of 2009 or will expire by the end of 2010. This section allows for an adjustment so that the cost of extending specified individual policies for a defined period (two years for estate tax and AMT, five years for Medicare physician payments, and permanently for the middle-class tax cuts) is not counted for statutory PAYGO purposes.

This scoring rule applies only for the purposes of statutory PAYGO. For other purposes, including the Congressional Budget Act and the congressional PAYGO rules, existing scoring rules and points of order apply.

General approach. The statute authorizes a maximum adjustment to the estimate of budgetary effects of PAYGO legislation in the four specified policy areas equal to the difference between:

The cost of continuing a specified policy under current law as of December 31, 2009, consistent with baseline calculations under section 257 of BBEDCA, which, for each of the four policy areas, would assume that the specified policy has expired (AMT and estate tax), or will expire by the end of 2010 (all other policies); and

The projected cost of the specified policy assuming the policy continues beyond its scheduled expiration date.

The cost of continuing these policies over the specified period is larger than the cost of letting them expire, as would happen under current law. The adjustment allows Congress to address these policies without having the cost added to the PAYGO scorecard. The difference between these two estimated costs is the maximum adjustment that may be used to offset the cost of legislation addressing each specified policy for the purposes of PAYGO enforcement. If the estimate of the legislation has a greater budgetary effect than the maximum amount of the adjustment, then the adjustment can be used to offset a portion of its cost. The additional cost would be counted for statutory PAYGO purposes. If a less costly policy is enacted, any remaining amount in the adjustment cannot be used to offset the cost of policies in other areas (as specified in Section 4(c)(3) of the PAYGO statute).

In addition, the adjustments in each policy area are further limited to prevent using the full amount of the available adjustment to offset the cost of a more generous policy for a shorter period. Under this limitation, the amount of the adjustment is estimated consistent with the time period covered by the eligible policy action.

Duration. This section expires on December 31, 2011, so any policies eligible for an adjustment must be enacted by that time in order to receive the adjustment.

(c)–(f) Policy areas eligible for adjustment. For statutory PAYGO purposes, legislation addressing four policy areas qualifies for a current policy adjustment to the estimate of that legislation's budgetary effects.

(c) Medicare Physician Payments. Under current law, the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula requires physician payments under Medicare part B to be cut automatically by over 21 percent after February 28, 2010. Section 7(c) provides a maximum adjustment equal to the difference between the cost of freezing through December 31, 2014, the Medicare Part B payment rates to physicians at the 2009 rate, and the cost of allowing the automatic cuts to occur after February 28, 2010. Legislation providing relief from the scheduled SGR cut—including legislation that reforms or supersedes the SGR formula—would only be scored for PAYGO purposes to the extent that it costs more than this five-year freeze at 2009 levels. If legislation to reform or supersede the SGR formula through or beyond 2014 is enacted that costs less than a five-year freeze in the years through 2014, any remaining amount in the adjustment could be used to offset costs of that policy after 2014, but the total adjustment cannot exceed the maximum adjustment amount of a five-year SGR freeze.

Estate and gift tax. Under EGTRRA, the estate tax exemption was gradually increased and the tax rate gradually lowered so that by 2009, the exemption level was $3.5 million for an individual, with amounts above the exemption level taxed at a 45 percent rate. In 2010, the estate tax is repealed, replaced with a new tax on inherited assets with unrealized capital gains. In 2011, with the expiration of EGTRRA, the estate tax will return, with the pre–2001 law parameters of a $1 million exemption for an individual and a top rate of 55 percent.

The maximum adjustment in section 7(d) is equal to the difference between the revenues expected from continuing the 2009 estate tax policy, with the nominal exemption level indexed for inflation, through December 31, 2011, and the revenues expected under the 2010 repeal and 2011 return to pre–2001 law. In other words, legislation restoring the estate tax would be scored for PAYGO purposes only to the extent that it costs more than implementing the 2009 policy (indexed) in 2010 and 2011. Because the cost of estate tax policy through 2011 will have budgetary effects beyond 2011, this section clarifies that the adjustment is intended to capture the full budgetary effects in all years resulting from the two-year policy change.

Alternative Minimum Tax. A ''patch'' for the AMT was provided in the Recovery Act, increasing the 2009 AMT exemption to $70,950 for couples and $46,700 for singles in order to prevent the number of taxpayers affected by the AMT from exploding from about four million to about 30 million. This patch expired at the end of 2009.

Section 7(e) provides a maximum adjustment equal to the difference between the revenues expected from adjusting the the AMT exemption levels through 2011 in order to hold the number of taxpayers affected by the AMT at 2008 levels (about 4.2 million), and the revenues expected assuming the expiration of the 2009 AMT patch. Because the cost of AMT relief through 2011 will have budgetary effects beyond 2011, this section clarifies that the adjustment is intended to capture the full budgetary effects in all years resulting from the two-year policy change.

(f) 2001 and 2003 middle-class tax cuts. The 2001 and 2003 income tax reductions enacted under EGTRRA and JGTRRA, as subsequently amended through December 31, 2009, are scheduled to expire at the end of 2010. Section 7(f) provides 12 adjustments for policies benefiting the middle class as they are in effect in 2010. The specific middle-class policies are:

10 percent bracket;

Child Tax Credit, including the expansion in the Recovery Act;

Marriage penalty relief, including the relevant EITC expansion in the Recovery Act;

Adoption credit;

Dependent care credit;

Employer-provided child care credit;

Education tax benefits;

25 percent and 28 percent brackets;

33 percent bracket, but only for individuals with incomes of $200,000 or less, and couples with incomes of $250,000 or less;

Reduced rates on capital gains and dividends, but only for individuals with incomes of $200,000 or less, and couples with incomes of $250,000 or less;

Repeal of the personal exemption phaseout and the limitation on itemized deductions, but only for individuals with incomes of $200,000 or less, and couples with incomes of $250,000 or less; and

Section 179 expensing for small businesses, allowing up to $125,000 of qualified property to be expensed, phasing out for property over $500,000.

The maximum adjustment for the policies in section 7(f) is equal to the difference between the revenues expected if the specified policy were in place after 2010 and the revenues expected if the related provisions expired as scheduled.

(g) Indexing for Inflation. Amounts indexed for inflation are done in accordance with the cost-of-living adjustment rules in section 1(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. That provision in the Code designates the Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers (usually expressed as CPI–U) as the measuring standard. Amounts indexed for inflation in this Act are the nominal exemption amount under the estate tax, as well as the income thresholds for income tax brackets, the rates for capital gains and dividends, the personal exemption phase-out, and the limitation on itemized deductions.

(h) Guidance on Estimates and Current Policy Adjustments. Estimates of budgetary effects of certain tax policies can vary depending on the order in which those policies are enacted into law. The PAYGO statute lays out three rules for addressing costs associated with the interaction of these various provisions.

I. For the interaction between AMT relief and the middle-class tax cuts, all interaction costs are scored as part of AMT relief. Specifically, estimates for determining the AMT adjustment must assume that all of the middle-class tax cuts eligible for a PAYGO adjustment have been enacted, even if these tax cuts have not yet been enacted.

II. Estimates for determining the adjustment for the middle-class tax cuts must assume that AMT relief follows current law as of the end of 2009—that is, they must assume that the 2009 AMT patch expired at the end of 2009, even if AMT relief beyond 2009 has already been enacted.

III. To address the interaction between individual middle-class tax provisions included in the same piece of legislation, provisions must be scored in the order in which they appear in the legislation.

Section 8—Application of BBEDCA: Section 8 specifies how various provisions of BBEDCA, including the special sequestration rules in section 256 of BBEDCA and the baseline rules in section 257 of BBEDCA, apply to this new PAYGO statute.

Section 9—Technical Corrections: Section 9 corrects typographical errors in the text of BBEDCA.

Section 10—Conforming Amendments: Section 10 makes conforming amendments to section 256 of BBEDCA. This section establishes special rules for sequestration for certain mandatory programs or updates the special rules to reflect programs as they now exist.

Section 11—Exempt Programs and Activities: Section 11 lists mandatory programs and activities that are exempt from sequestration. Exemptions under this Act are consistent with the exemption list that was first created in 1990.

That said, the exemption list has been updated to address accounts that have had their account names or numbers changed since 1990, or have been merged or divided. Further, new accounts (since 1990) have been treated the same way that analogous accounts were treated. For example, in the 1990 law the major low-income programs such as Medicaid were exempted from sequestration. The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), new since 1990, is in the same category as Medicaid and also exempt.

The list has been expanded to clarify the treatment of certain transportation programs, notably federal-aid highways and grants-in-aid for airports. The budgetary treatment of these programs is split. They receive mandatory contract authority through authorization bills, but are treated as discretionary programs because their annual spending is controlled by obligation limitations in appropriations bills. These programs are exempt from sequestration to the extent they are controlled by obligation limitations. Remaining mandatory resources in these programs are subject to sequestration.

Finally, as noted in Section 6, non-exempt accounts are subject to a single, uniform percentage cut if a sequestration is required (except Medicare, where the cut is limited to four percent). Under the 1990 law, if a small sequestration was needed, four programs would have been the first ones sequestered: special milk, vocational rehabilitation state grants, student loans, and foster care/adoption assistance. Because this PAYGO statute eliminated this rule, the first three of those programs are treated as any non-exempt account would be treated. But the foster care account is included in the exempt list on the grounds that it is like other low-income programs that were exempted from sequestration in the 1990 law.

Section 12—Determinations and Points of Order: Section 12 affirms that nothing in this Act is intended to limit the authority of the Budget Committee Chairmen to make determinations and estimates of the costs or savings of legislation. In addition, the section authorizes CBO to consult with the Budget Committees to resolve any ambiguities in the interpretation of the Act.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, as Yogi Berra once said, It's déjà vu all over again. No way. It is déjà vu all over again.

Just a few months ago, the Democrats marched us down here to the House floor to raise the debt ceiling by over a quarter of a trillion dollars. But that wasn't enough. Here we are again, 90 days later, this time for a whopping $1.9 trillion debt limit increase.

For the uninitiated, a century ago Congress very wisely instituted a statutory cap on the amount that the Federal Government could borrow. Unfortunately, Congress being Congress, this body raised that cap dozens of times during the 20th century and has apparently carried that tradition into this new decade with spectacular new fashion.

As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are no doubt clamoring over themselves to point out, both parties have done it in times of war and times of crisis, and more recently, this Democrat majority has made spending more of a priority than saving. In short, Madam Speaker, excuses don't make it right.

I wanted to mention PAYGO. I actually voted for PAYGO. I was one of 18 Republicans who, when the Democrats took over, I voted for PAYGO. Unfortunately, this Democrat leadership has waived it so often it has become very ineffective. They waive it more than they implement it.

So I ask my colleagues, don't be misled by so-called PAYGO language, because it simply isn't real.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

We're all entitled to our own opinions but not to our own facts, and it is a fact that the day President Obama put his hand on the Bible to be sworn in as President of the United States, he inherited a $1.3 trillion deficit, a record deficit in this country.

This is an opportunity for all of us to stop just talking about the deficit and debts and actually do something about it. For the first time since 2002, Congress will bring, as a matter of law, the commonsense proposition that the Federal Government should pay for what it buys. And the history of success on this is clear. When the Congress lived under the PAYGO rules in the 1990s, we did turn deficits into record surpluses. After PAYGO was abandoned, deficits skyrocketed, our national debt clearly doubled.

Much has been made by the other side of the aisle about the deficit in the first year of the Obama administration. The Congressional Budget Office analysis is pretty clear that the contributors to that were two wars, unpaid for; a record mandatory prescription drug bill, unpaid for; and, of course, two tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the wealthiest Americans, all on our national credit card, all running us deeper into the red.

This legislation says enough is enough, and it says that virtually any new policy that reduces revenue or increases mandatory spending will have to be offset elsewhere in the budget. That is just common sense to every American family. And it says that if for some reason we don't abide by that discipline, you're going to have an across-the-board enforcement mechanism that will sequester the funds.

It's time to do what every family has to do and pay as we go.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for purposes of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I rise in opposition to this reckless spending proposal.

We simply cannot afford to continue on the same course.

Our current debt is $12.36 trillion. I have opposed past efforts to increase the debt limit, and again today I will vote against raising the limit.

The amount is staggering, $1.9 trillion.

It will raise the limit to $14.294 trillion—an incomprehensible figure.

Our economy is out of sync—currently we have no comprehensive plan for energy, the federal budget or making our manufacturing base competitive in the global market.

In addition Madame Speaker, I am mystified by the attempt today to force members to simultaneously vote on the debt limit increase and the proposed pay-go rules.

These types of shenanigans—particularly on something as significant as a $1.9 trillion debt ceiling increase—are exactly why Americans have lost faith in their government.

Now is not the time to increase our debt ceiling—vote "no" on H.J. Res. 45. It will force the government to focus on the economy and it will start restoring some faith in the Congress.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. In this time of record debt, high unemployment, and uncertain economic conditions, a focus on fiscal responsibility is critical—real fiscal responsibility, not words like ''commonsense'' but applying it in a real policy.

For months, President Obama and the majority have talked about the importance of this responsibility, responsibility by tripling Federal spending and then saying we're going to have a freeze. The President has suggested a spending freeze, and we've heard a lot about bending the cost curve with health care reform. But, Madam Speaker, I think we all know that actions speak louder than words.

The fine print in this so-called PAYGO bill is a $2 trillion increase in the national debt. Just read the bill and you see the truth. It's very different from the rhetoric that we hear. Instead of being true to their word, the majority has increased spending by an unprecedented 66 percent over the last year and pushed the deficit to $1.4 trillion in 2009, an 800 percent increase over the last administration.

Instead of listening to the American people's pleas that Congress focus on the economy and jobs, they spent the last year pushing an unpopular, ineffective, and wildly expensive government takeover of health care. Instead of taking action on steps that would halt unsustainable spending in Washington, majority leaders are about to vote to increase our debt limit by $1.9 trillion, the largest one-time increase of the debt in the history of the United States of America.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, the American people are tired of tightening their budget and counting pennies while the Federal Government continues along a path of irresponsible spending, risky borrowing, and staggering debt.

Washington has a spending problem. It's time to end it. And these days, it seems more like an addiction. Instead of more broken promises to cut spending and reduce the deficit, it's past time for President Obama and Democratic leaders to respond to the American people to end this tyranny of runaway spending in Washington.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, you hear a lot about when the debt was incurred. I think it's important that we all understand that the policies that were put in place that caused that debt to be incurred started in 2001 with the economic package. Subsequently, we had the war, and then we had a recession. All that came from 2001 to 2007. That was under the policies of the previous administration and the previous Congress. So I want the Members to keep that in mind.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BOYD for yielding. Let me start by commending our leadership for calling this legislation to the floor to restore the same budget enforcement rules that lead to the record budget surpluses that we enjoyed in the 1990s.

While I commend the Senate for finally approving PAYGO, following our lead in passing it at the beginning of the last Congress, I am deeply disappointed that the Senate could not summon the support to add the national deficit reduction commission to this bill.

The fact that several Senate Republicans who cosponsored the deficit commission, including the minority leader, voted against their own legislation illustrates the deficit of trust mentioned by the President in his State of the Union and is yet another example of the corrosive forces that fuel growing public cynicism about our political process.

Following the Senate's inaction on this issue, I applaud the President's intent to issue by Executive Order a commission to attack the bipartisan deficit, and I am encouraged by reports that the Speaker of the House and the Senate majority leader will call the commission's recommendations to a vote.

Madam Speaker, only strong leadership will propel us to overcome the challenges we face. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The scene and the content of this debate is really like a bad movie in a lot of ways. You rewind the tape and we have ultimately had this conversation about a year ago when the Democratic majority, Madam Speaker, said to the American public, look, we want to borrow $1 trillion, and with that trillion, trust us, it's going to be great. Jobs are going to be created. The sun is going to come out. The tulips are going to be there, and it's all going to be fabulous.

It didn't work out that way. Eleven percent unemployment in the State of Illinois, the difference between the promise of the borrowing, 8 percent unemployment, has now eclipsed to 11 percent in Illinois. And in my home

State, Madam Speaker, that means 200,000 people have taken on debt and haven't been rescued. They weren't rescued in December when the majority said we're going to raise the debt limit again, and they're going to be rescued by this. This is a classic underperformance.

And the majority, with all due respect, hasn't recognized the failure of the stimulus. In fact, they don't even like to use the word ''stimulus,'' Madam Speaker.

So in this context, I say let's stop this madness. Let's get back to our first priorities. Our first priorities are to be a nation of disciplined spenders, and we ought not to empower folks to borrow and create more and more debt into the future.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) who is also a cosponsor of the original PAYGO legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Two points. Number one, my question is, what is the other side afraid of? There are certain caricatures that they just want tax cuts, we just want spending. The bottom line is that whatever your intention, no matter how good and noble you think it is, you have to pay for it. The two wars, two tax cuts, and $2.3 trillion in deficits that we inherited and a $750 billion bailout of Wall Street requested by President George Bush and Henry Paulson have to be paid for. The stimulus that's being ridiculed is the only thing that conservative and liberal economists have acknowledged has diminished the decline in the economy.

Good intentions are not a substitute for fiscal responsibility. We are acknowledging that. We have different goals. We have to fight those out. But why, despite whether your goal is a tax cut or a spending program, won't you agree to pay for it? That's what this legislation is about.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill, a $2 trillion increase of our debt limit to more than $14 trillion. Over the past 3 years, it is the Democratic Party that has controlled both Houses of Congress, and we have seen the debt limit increased dramatically, six times, totaling $5.3 trillion, an increase of 60 percent in only 3 years.

In fiscal year 2007, the Federal Government spent approximately $2.7 trillion; in 2009, $3.5 trillion, and last week we were sent a new budget proposal by the President that would even break that record. We must take concrete action to get our spending under control and get our economy moving again.

I fear that unless we take such action, the government's bond rating will be reduced, an event that could have catastrophic results for our markets.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), a real leader on this issue for all of his years in Congress.

Mr. HILL. I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This is legislation that we Blue Dogs have been fighting for for many, many years. And it's very satisfying that it is coming to fruition today.

I'm not here to play the blame game. There's a lot of blame to go around about our Nation's budget deficit. What we need is an instrument that gets us back on a pathway of fiscal responsibility. And we know that PAYGO works. It worked in the 1990s. And I should also say that it was a Republican President who proposed it. President Bush, Senior, was the one that thought this was a good idea. President Clinton thought it was a good idea. And it resulted in budget surpluses.

Now we've got problems with our Nation's budget deficit. There's no question about that. This is the instrument that gets us back on track to fiscal responsibility. And so I join my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I would hope a few others on that side of the aisle, to get us back on that path.

This is the right thing to do, and after many years, it's finally a reality.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. It's time for a little bit of truth-telling about their side and about our side.

Truth-telling about our side is that back when we were in charge, we didn't do so well on controlling runaway Federal spending. My colleagues who know me well know that I many times found myself at cross purposes in fighting the President of my own party and some leadership in my own party in some of those big spending fights. But under the last administration, we doubled the national debt. I want to stipulate that.

But frankly, that's no excuse for what's happening today, Madam Speaker. Over the last 3 years, the Democratic majority has literally broken the ceiling on fiscal responsibility, and, as I just admitted, that ceiling was pretty high.

Since Democrats took control of Congress in January 2007, the national debt has increased by $3.96 trillion, a 42 percent increase in 3 years. To keep up with this spending binge, Congress has increased the debt limit five times over the last 3 years, three times since the current administration took office 1 year ago.

The statutory debt increase that comes before us today, $1.9 trillion, is the largest one-time debt increase in U.S. history. This is the fifth increase, as I mentioned, in the last 19 months. This one-time increase in the debt limit of $1.9 trillion is actually larger than the entire GDP of almost every country in the world. It's larger than the GDP of Canada, Russia, Spain or Brazil, and it's larger than the GDP of Australia and Poland combined.

The American people are looking at this extraordinary gusher of spending and debt, and they're asking the question, When will it stop? And the answer, as we look at the budget that the administration submitted earlier this week, is no time soon. I hasten to add the administration just this week announced plans for a budget, $3.8 trillion in scope with a $1.6 trillion deficit, $2 trillion in higher taxes.

And let me say with respect, the American people looking in ought not to be deceived by the promises of fiscal discipline known as PAYGO. The truth is the bill before us today is about 58 pages long, and 32 of those pages are all the programs that are exempted from the PAYGO requirements. Forty percent of Federal spending is exempted from the fiscal discipline fix that we are being told is encompassed in PAYGO. The truth is what ''PAYGO'' really means here in Washington is that you pay and they go on spending.

The fact is what we see here is a failure of leadership. President Obama, as a United States Senator, said in March of 2006 when he came out against raising the debt limit in a vote, 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 recklessness. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership.

So said then-Senator Barack Obama in March 2006.

Let me suggest he was right then, and his words are equally true today.

The American people long for us to put our fiscal house in order. They long for us to embrace true fiscal discipline and reform. They long for this administration and this Congress to lead us away from the brink of fiscal disaster. This PAYGO, this debt ceiling vote is no solution, and I urge its opposition.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, PAYGO, when it was put in place in the past in the 1990s, was put in place with bipartisan votes. It is my hope that the gentleman from Indiana will work with us in a bipartisan way.

The first thing we must do is understand exactly what PAYGO does. He said, for example, that PAYGO has a list of exemptions which wouldn't affect current spending programs. Well, PAYGO has nothing to do with current spending. It speaks to additional and new entitlement, mandatory spending programs and-or tax reductions, changes in law.

So the first thing we should do, Madam Speaker, is get a good understanding about exactly what PAYGO does do—stop digging the hole, and then we can begin to fill in the hole and reach fiscal responsibility, reach a balanced budget like we did back in the 1990s.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, every day families across the country make sacrifices to stay within their household budgets. They know you can't spend what you haven't saved. But for the past decade, Congress has failed to grasp that simple premise. That failure has led to what the President has aptly described as a deficit of trust. It's hard to govern when you don't have the public trust, and it's hard to borrow when you have lost the trust of world markets.

During the 1990s, PAYGO forced Members to make hard decisions. However, PAYGO rules were waived in 2001 on the theory that we could pay for two wars with two tax cuts. Today, thanks to years of hard work by the Blue Dogs, we're taking the first step to win back the public trust.

Madam Speaker, today I am a Blue Dog.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. RYAN to control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirty seconds were remaining, so you have 15 minutes and 30 seconds that you control.

□ 1445

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the vote we are having here today is not a vote for PAYGO, or whatever we want to call it. It is a vote to raise the debt ceiling. It is a vote to raise the debt ceiling by $1.9 trillion. The majority might argue this isn't about the debt, but let's not be fooled. This is about a debt ceiling. Treasury has to raise it because we have had this incredible spending spree, and we are on an unsustainable trajectory of more debt.

Now, let's take a look at where we are right now. Right now, the burden of the debt on our economy is 60 percent. That is worse than what is required in Europe, because under this budget that is passing, it goes up to 77 percent of our economy by the end of the President's budget. Now, already, foreigners hold about half of our debt, and China lends us the most. The problem we have, Madam Speaker, is that the Chinese aren't going to keep lending us all their money.

Let me tell you a little bit about what will happen to America. The debt trajectory we are on will weaken America. The debt goes to catastrophic levels in this country which will destroy our economy—that is a tough word—and for sure give the next generation an inferior standard of living. These are facts. They are not opinions.

Now, one thing that I find interesting about PAYGO is the budget that we are living under right now doubles and triples our debt in 10 years, and it is all PAYGO compliant. The debt skyrockets under the current budget, and it all does so within PAYGO. And if you actually look at the President's budget, it says: with this PAYGO rule, not only will the debt triple in 10 years, but we will have another $473 billion under PAYGO to spend on top of that. That is what PAYGO does, Madam Speaker.

PAYGO has been in place before. We have seen it. It started in 2007 when the Democrats took over Congress. At that time, when PAYGO was put in place, we had a $161 billion deficit. We have a $1.6 trillion deficit now. Forty percent of the entire budget is exempt from PAYGO. It does not do a thing at all to reduce the deficits. In fact, what PAYGO does is it locks in the deficits at its current levels, and it doesn't address the spending crisis.

Not only is spending growing at an unsustainable rate, not only are entitlements growing themselves right into bankruptcy, not only are we looking at bankruptcy of Medicare, Society Security, and Medicaid right around the corner. PAYGO is ripe with loopholes. It exempts 40 percent of spending, as I mentioned. It exempts mandatory spending on appropriation bills. It exempts all spending designed as emergencies, and more than 160 programs are exempt from its enforcement.

The point is this, Madam Speaker: my greatest concern is that if we pass this illusion of fiscal control, that will replace any real fiscal spending control whatsoever. It is good talk. It sounds good. When you look at the details, it accomplishes nothing. And when it is ever applied, it is only to chase higher spending with higher taxes. We should reject this and start over.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute 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 American public must be baffled by the charges and countercharges going back and forth. I would just invite, Madam Speaker, those listening to make their own decision based on two facts.

First is that the gentleman from Kentucky said a few minutes ago that the present administration had tripled the Federal spending. I would invite people to go look at the record, which says that the 2008 budget was $2.9 trillion. The proposed budget for this year is $3.7 trillion. That is not tripling.

Second, in the years in which we have had the PAYGO rule in effect, we have accumulated 30 percent of the Federal debt. In the years we have not had it in effect, we have accumulated 70 percent of the Federal debt.

Choose based upon the record and I think people will see that voting ''yes'' on this commonsense legislation is the right path.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida controls 12 minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls 12½ minutes.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mrs. LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, two points I would like to make. One is this is not the same statutory pay-as-you-go as was in effect in the 1990s. During the years that President Clinton was working with a Republican Congress, they did balance the budget and they did create a surplus, but they did it using a statutory pay-as-you-go mechanism, or perhaps it was a nonstatutory pay-as-you-go mechanism, that actually didn't have as many exemptions as this one does. The fact that we are using a statutory pay-as-you-go terminology that really doesn't limit in any way spending to be paid for is simply disingenuous.

The other point I would like to make is about our debt limit. We don't have to raise the debt limit today, the debt ceiling. What we would have to do is put strict spending caps on ourselves, roll back the budget to fiscal year 2008 levels; we would have to pull in stimulus money, TARP money, and other expenditures that have either been returned to the government or not yet made. And we wouldn't even have to raise this debt ceiling.

So this is an issue of lacking fiscal responsibility. We are in a situation of borrow-as-you-go, not pay-as-you-go.

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

I would like to remind the gentlelady from Wyoming that we did borrow-as-you-go since 2001, and we want to do pay-as-you-go starting now.

It is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, the vice chair of the Budget Committee, Ms. SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Today, the House will take a major step in efforts to balance the Federal budget. Like American families and businesses, Congress must be fiscally responsible and pay for what we spend.

Our focus this year is twofold: restoring our economy and reducing the deficit. PAYGO legislation is an essential step in the process of cutting the deficit. Growing jobs and restoring fiscal discipline is not easy or quick, particularly given the financial situation we inherited.

In 2002, Republicans allowed PAYGO to expire and turned budget surpluses into a deficit for 2009 of $1.3 trillion. How did this happen? They grew annual spending by over 8 percent. They passed the largest expansion of entitlements without paying for it. They started and didn't pay for two wars. And they gave and did not pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. Collectively, these actions added $8 trillion to the national debt.

We must agree, and we should, as Republicans and Democrats, agree to pay for what we spend as an important step in putting our Nation back on track towards fiscal discipline and responsible budgeting. I would say vote ''yes'' for PAYGO legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, already in just 2 years, an 84 percent increase in enacted spending, 84 percent, a $1.2 trillion stimulus bill that has us mired in 10 percent unemployment, a $450 billion omnibus bill, another $400 billion omnibus bill. The explosion of spending is unprecedented in our Nation's history. And that leads us to the vote that is before us today. Increase the debt limit for the third time in 12 months; increase it another $1.9 trillion, our Democratic colleagues say, so that we can increase the burden per household $16,214. Where will it all end?

And now, just this week, we hear from the President of the United States: we haven't spent enough. Let's spend some more. Let's propose a budget that will simply triple—triple—the national debt over 10 years.

Madam Speaker, the American people are tired of the spending, tired of the debt, tired of the deficits, and certainly tired of the bailouts.

And don't take my word for it, Madam Speaker. Let's hear what CNBC had to say about the matter of the President's budget: ''part of a record $3.8 trillion budget that would boost the deficit beyond any in the Nation's history.''

The New York Times: ''The budget projects that the deficit will peak at nearly $1.6 trillion.'' It goes on to say: ''and remain at economically troublesome levels over the remainder of the decade.''

Wall Street Journal: ''All of this spending must be financed, and so deficits and taxes are both scheduled to rise to record levels.''

And so what do we hear? We hear from our Democratic friends, well, let's have PAYGO.

Well, what did we learn about PAYGO? Number one, they have already had a House rule for 2 years. And at least as practiced in the last fiscal year, 98 percent, Madam Speaker, 98 percent of all spending was either waived or it was exempt. PAYGO is a budget fig leaf.

Well, what does the President suggest? He says let's freeze spending. But what we discover when we run the numbers is that he doesn't turn on the freezer for a year. He turns it off quite soon after that. And when you plug in the numbers, it is a difference between growing government 49.27 percent versus 49.01. They are bankrupting America. Reject this vote and reject this debt limit.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, the elements of this bill are critically important. Pay-as-you-go is essential. It is critically essential at this point in the issues being dealt with by this country.

If you look back over the course of the last several years, you will see how this huge deficit has gone up over and over again.

Let me just give a couple of examples of the way in which the huge debt that we have now has increased under the leadership of the opposition on the other side of the aisle here, and the previous President.

One of those was the military invasion of Iraq, which was completely unjustified. There was no justification for it whatsoever. The price of that is approaching now $1 trillion.

Another issue that was dealt with in the context when they were in the majority was the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America. Those tax cuts have now created the greatest concentration of wealth in the hands of the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans that this country has ever experienced since 1929, 1930. Now, we know what brought that about, and we know the same kind of circumstances that we are dealing with now.

Let me just give another example. They are not very much in favor of things like health care. Take, for example, what they tried to do with Medicare back in 2003 and how the price of that has gone up so much. They introduced prescription drug provisions in the Medicare program, but they would not allow for the negotiation of any price. They would just say that whatever the drug companies want to charge you, that is what you are going to have to pay. And that price is now going up to somewhere in the neighborhood of $700 billion.

All of that has created the huge deficit that we have; and if you look at the way in which that deficit has adversely affected this economy, you see it over and over again. In housing, for example: over the course of the last 1½ years, the housing situation in this country has gone desperate. All of these things need to be changed. This bill will deal with it constructively and effectively, and it should be passed unanimously.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to say the concept of PAYGO sounds great, but it is an absolute fig leaf when you look at the practicality of it only applying to 2 percent of the budget. It's just not a genuine proposal.

But I want to say this: I think it is good to have this discussion. But both parties have been spending too much money, and not just Congress, but the Federal Reserve. Just think about 2008. Bear Stearns bailout, $29 billion. A Bush stimulus bill in May of 2008, $168 billion. The Fannie Mae bailout, $200 billion. The AIG bailout, $85 billion, going now to $140 billion. And that was under the Democrat majority in the House, and President Bush signed it into law. So both parties have been in this mix.

And then comes President Obama. A $787 billion stimulus bill that brought our unemployment from 8 percent to 10 percent. An omnibus spending bill, $410 billion. A health care proposal that costs over $1 trillion. Cap-and-trade that will cost American households $1,500 per house. And another stimulus bill that the Democrats, under Speaker PELOSI, just passed in December of about $60 billion.

□ 1500

Ladies and gentlemen, both parties are guilty, but this is the essence of it. It is a tripling of the national debt. Therefore, we have a debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is a mechanism, an outside trigger to force Democrats and Republicans to come together and cut spending. But instead what do we do? We move the trigger. And the result is this. And guess who inherits it. The children. And Gen X and Gen Y, who will already not get Social Security because it is going broke, and Medicare that has $39 billion in unobligated debt right now. We are not facing what we need to do.

Instead of moving the debt ceiling, we need to be going back into our spending and cutting spending, not kicking the can down the road for another Congress, another election, and another generation. Vote ''no'' on this. Let's stay over the weekend and start coming together to cut the budget.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota, a fellow Blue Dog, Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him so much for the leadership he has shown on budget matters. Receiving fiscal lectures from this crowd is a little bit like getting investment advice from Bernie Madoff. You know, when George Bush took the Presidency, the debt was $5.6 trillion. And under majorities in the House and Senate, with a Republican President, the debt doubled. Part of the reason is the expiration of pay-as-you-go budgeting principles. Don't take my word for it. The record is clear.

When we adhered, on a bipartisan basis, with the Bush I agreement, the budget '97 agreement, and the Democrat-passed '93 agreement to pay-as-you-go, we set the path towards surplus. When pay-as-you-go expired, Katy bar the door, and the deficits exploded.

Now, as we get our hands around this fiscal situation, my friend Mr. RYAN is in part right when he says that this is not a full measured response. You know, we have got a long journey. We have got to begin with a solid step. Restoring pay-as-you-go budget principles is that step.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we need to step up to the plate. Look at what is happening with the current government right now. I have three children. They are 5 years old, 6 years old, and our oldest just turned 8. For the last 40 years, the size of our government has been remarkably consistent, about 20 percent of the economy. Meaning we have taken 20 cents out of every dollar made in America to go to the Federal Government. When my three children are my age, the current government we have right now, this is before you would even pass the President's budget, that current government goes to 40 percent of our economy. You will have to take 40 cents out of every dollar made in America just to keep the government we have now in place at that time, doubling the taxes on the next generation.

I asked the Congressional Budget Office what would the income tax rates have to be to support all of this when my kids are my age? The lowest tax bracket, which is now at 10 percent, they said that would have to go to 25 percent. The middle income tax brackets for middle income families go up to 66 percent. Top tax bracket on small businesses, 88 percent.

Madam Speaker, we know we are crashing our economy with this borrow-and-spend mentality. And all of that is PAYGO compliant. This is not budget discipline, it is an illusion. Let's come together and fix this problem.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, a great leader on this issue for many, many, many years, leader of the Blue Dogs, Mr. TANNER.

Mr. TANNER. You know, if we accept that everything that everybody has said on both sides of the aisle is true, that is still not, in my view, a good financial reason to vote against this bill. It may be a good political reason, but it is not a good financial reason.

Yes, this bill is imperfect, but it is a first step. PAYGO only applies to those laws that are enacted that either demand by the law itself that Federal revenues be altered or that spending be changed. It does not affect discretionary spending and so forth. It is a first step. This bill is not perfect. But whatever your reason is is not a good reason, financially speaking, to vote against something that is good. Perfect? No. But the perfect is always the enemy of the good in a legislative body.

And so unless one wants to talk politics, if one wants to talk finances, I cannot think of a good financial reason to say, ''Well, let's just do this if this is all we can do.'' It is a good first step, and it ought to be taken.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida controls 6½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege now to recognize the Speaker of the House, and yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this important issue, an issue of importance to our country, to our economic stability, to our fiscal soundness, and to our children and our grandchildren.

This is an issue, pay-as-you-go, who could oppose this great idea? It has a provenance in the Democratic Party that goes back over 30 years, but it has been in practice in a bipartisan way over time. To my progressive friends, I say that Congressman GEORGE MILLER of California introduced a resolution in 1982 at the Democratic convention, mid term convention in Philadelphia, calling for pay-as-you-go. It was passed and adopted as part of the Democratic platform, a measure for fiscal soundness, recognizing that even those of us who see a role in government, a limited role in government and investments in our children's future know that it must be paid for or else we are heaping debt onto our children. That was in '82.

It wasn't until later, with a Republican President, President Bush, and a Democratic Congress, that PAYGO was implemented. Then later, under a Democratic President, President Clinton, and a Republican Congress, PAYGO was implemented. All of those times it brought down the deficit and, in the case of President Clinton, it led to a path, a trajectory of $5.6 trillion in surplus.

It hit, I wouldn't say a bump in the road, I would say a giant mogul when President Bush came in with a Republican Congress and the Republican President abandoned PAYGO. And now for the past 8 years, up until 2009, January, we have had these growing deficits. Here we are again sweeping up behind to get rid of the trajectory that we are on of increasing the deficit.

So here it is. It is an historic day. I am so very happy. When I became Speaker of the House, the very first day we passed legislation that made PAYGO the rule of the House. Today we will make it the law of the land. I talked about the progressive provenance of this idea, but because of the extraordinary leadership of the Blue Dog coalition in the Congress, this pay-as-you-go is part of a blueprint for fiscal responsibility that has been their mantra and which they have made the mantra of the House Democrats, and I hope today in a bipartisan way of the House of Representatives.

I commend Mr. BOYD for his relentless leadership on this subject; BARON HILL, author of the legislation; JIM MATHESON, STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN, the leadership of the Blue Dog coalition; and a person who has been a relentless and articulate spokesperson on this issue, JOHN TANNER, zwhom I had the honor of following in this debate. As I say, the Blue Dogs have made this a priority.

But it is out there also with subjecting spending to the harshest scrutiny. Every Federal dollar that is spent must be subjected to scrutiny to make sure the taxpayer gets his or her money's worth. Subject the spending to scrutiny. And that is what President Obama is proposing with his freeze and cuts.

Pay-as-you-go. This largely applies to the entitlements, which are the largest part, biggest increases in the deficit. And third, the commission to review the entitlements and how we can control cost. This is an obligation that we have to our children. It is an important part of the work that we do, to be able to make difficult, difficult choices on how we make investments, understanding that they must be paid for.

So the luxury of just heaping bills with projects or whatever, or in terms of new entitlements especially in terms of PAYGO, that day is over unless it is paid for. So how is it a reflection of the values of our country; how important it is to meeting the needs of the American people. Would we put it before something else? That is what this is about, about prioritizing so that we can get on a path of deficit reduction, reducing the national debt, reducing the debt service, hundreds of billions of dollars of interest on the debt, which gets us really nothing in return.

So the time is long overdue for this to be taken for granted that the Federal Government will pay as it goes, that we will be on a path of deficit reduction, and that every action that we take in any bill that we take will have to meet the test. Does this reduce the deficit? Does this create jobs? Does this grow our economy? Does this stabilize our economy well into the future? Central to all of that, and a very strong pillar of fiscal responsibility, is this PAYGO legislation that we have here today.

I couldn't be more thrilled for what this means about the fundamentals of how we govern, how we choose, and how we honor our responsibility to future generations to reduce the deficit. With all the respect and admiration and gratitude to our Blue Dog coalition for being so persistent in passing this, and my congratulations, if I may, to the Senate for passing the bill. It has taken a while, but they are there, and now after this and it goes to the President, it will be the law of the land. I think this is cause for celebration.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it would be recklessly naive to go about our business in Washington pretending there won't be severe consequences for the mountains of debt we are piling up. Yet today it is evident that this kind of willful ignorance is sweeping across Washington. We are set to lift our Nation's debt burden to $14 trillion.

Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues in this chamber if they know how many zeroes 14 trillion has. I would ask the American people if they know how many zeroes are in 14 trillion. It is 14 trillion. It is beyond comprehension to be talking about numbers this big. More precisely, the limit is 1, 4, 2, 9, 4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.

It is a travesty. The writing is on the wall. Congress needs to wake up and realize that the future of American prosperity is in dire straits, mortal danger. As Americans hunker down to weather the economic storm, Democrats in Congress boosted Federal spending by 12 percent. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot about the majority's PAYGO scheme, but this will not affect any spending that has already happened.

□ 1515

In fact, it will perpetuate the problem by locking in that spending going forward. And the majority's solution to offset all of their spending is more tax increases, which will kill jobs at the time we need them most. Supporters of this legislation will pull the wool over the American people's eyes and claim the mantle of fiscal responsibility, but the American people aren't buying it. By voting in favor of this PAYGO bill, the majority will be increasing the debt burden on our children and grandchildren by $1.9 trillion. Strip away the sweet-sounding rhetoric, and that's what this bill is all about.

Madam Speaker, I just end with this rhetorical question: How effective can this so-called panacea really be when the debt has risen by $5.4 trillion since the majority imposed PAYGO in this very House over 3 years ago?

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER).

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, I'm proud to stand in support of statutory PAYGO. Pay-as-you-go legislation was a key factor, as we have heard, in delivering the budget surpluses of the 1990s. The Republican-controlled Congress allowed pay-as-you-go to expire in 2002, contributing to the dramatic turnaround from a projected surplus of $5.6 trillion when President Clinton left office to a projected deficit of more than $11 trillion at the end of the last administration.

Restoring statutory PAYGO will help bring our country out of the red and back into the black. As the saying goes, a journey begins with the first step. I'm proud to cast this vote as Washington takes the first step back to fiscal responsibility and sensible spending. Our path to fiscal responsibility starts today. Restoring PAYGO is the first step to enforcing fiscal discipline and removing the burden of Federal debt from the American people. It's my hope this will be the first of many steps that both Democrats and Republicans take to balance our budget and be good stewards of taxpayer funds.

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

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the statutory PAYGO act. This bill, which I'm proud to cosponsor, will help restore fiscal discipline by enacting into law the most basic principle of responsible accounting, that every dollar spent must be offset by a dollar earned or saved. This is the way that American families balance their finances, and this same principle should apply to the Federal budget.

This legislation is particularly important at a time when Congress also faces the troubling task of raising the statutory debt limit. I am truly dismayed by the need to raise the ceiling of our national debt, which already exceeds $12 trillion. We simply cannot keep borrowing our way to a better future. It is time that we take decisive action to reduce our Federal deficit while continuing to invest in our economy and combat unemployment.

In Rhode Island, the unemployment is now 12.9 percent, the third highest in the country. Put simply, Rhode Islanders are still looking for jobs, but they are also looking for a government they can trust to live within its fiscal means. This is going to require the will and cooperation of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike to solve our budgetary challenges. Today, it begins by passing the statutory pay-as-you-go act.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and send a strong message to the American people that the days of fiscal irresponsibility are over.

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

The Speaker of the House came and just said something to the effect that this was a proud moment, a happy occasion, a bill she's really excited about. The bill we're about to vote on, Madam Speaker, raises the national debt ceiling by $1.9 trillion. Even if I were a supporter of this bill, I wouldn't be proud of it.

I'm taking a look at the President's budget. On page 172, table S–9, the President's PAYGO proposal says that at the end of the budget window we can spend another $473 billion. So we're saying all the debt that's going up, the tripling of the national debt that we're giving to our kids and grandkids, not only does that comply with PAYGO, we can go ahead and spend another $473 billion on top of it.

This, Madam Speaker, is a fiscal charade. Real people from both parties need to step up and solve this problem. I have thrown out a few ideas of my own. I hope other Republicans and Democrats do the same. Because, Madam Speaker, if we don't tackle this problem, it's going to tackle us.

Our constituents sent us here to be a part of a solution and not a part of the problem. We know irrefutably we're going to bequeath this mountain of deficit and debt onto the next generation. Both of our parties share the blame. No one party corners the virtue on fiscal responsibility. But we're going to, together, have to come down here and fix this problem once and for all. And doing this doesn't do it. Doing this is a cop-out. Doing this raises the debt limit $1.9 trillion and gives us a fiscal cop-out so we can go talk tough in the election about how we did this and that while we bequeath the next generation an inferior standard of living.

I didn't come here to make sure that my three kids are going to have a life that's worse off than ours. Nobody here wants that. So let's get this fixed, defeat this bill, come together, and do real fiscal discipline. The American people are under attack. We overspend.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls 3½ minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, it's been a good debate, and I join my colleague and friend Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin in a call for working together in a bipartisan way to solve these problems. Madam Speaker, that's the only way that we will solve this massive problem that we have. I don't think any of us take pleasure—I know Mr. RYAN doesn't and I don't—in being here and talking about having to raise the debt ceiling because of policies we have put in place in the past that have incurred a tremendous deficit and mounting debt in this country. I would be less pleased if I had voted for those policies, and I would be embarrassed.

I can give you an example: the economic package of 2001 that carried us down this trail; subsequently, 9/11; subsequently, Medicare prescription drug programs unpaid for; wars that we continued to cut taxes while we were committing our troops overseas and hundreds of billions of dollars to prosecute those wars.

Madam Speaker, we have to stop this foolish policy of spending more than we take in. Congress has consistently shown that we don't have the will to discipline ourselves when it comes to spending the revenue. Pay-as-you-go legislation is a tool that will put us back on the right path to fiscal responsibility. It worked in the past, as others have said, put in place first by George W. Bush, Sr., along with the Democratic Congress, and then later on by President Clinton with the Republican Congress. We can do it again if we work in a bipartisan way. This is a great first step, though.

For those who criticize the legislation as having too many exemptions, I'm very pleased to hear Mr. RYAN and others say they've changed their tune about exemptions, because I've got some vote sheets here that show that they voted to enact spending programs or mandatory programs that we had paid for, but they voted against the bill when it's paid for and then voted for it when it's not paid for. So I assume that means that they have taken a different approach into how we're going to do business in the future. This pay-as-you-go legislation not only will encourage that, but will require it statutorily.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution. Not because it is good practice for us to continue increasing the national debt limit, but because for the first time since it expired under the previous administration, we are making PAYGO a statutory requirement.

In addition to other efforts by the Obama administration and Congress, PAYGO requirements will help us get our financial house back in order from the mess that was handed to us by the previous administration.

After two wars, and tax cuts that were not paid for, the $5.6 trillion dollar surplus we experienced in 2000 turned into a $1.3 trillion deficit.

In the 1990s, the Clinton administration turned the deficits accumulated in the two previous presidencies into record surpluses. One of the key tools in this transformation was the PAYGO rule, which required Congress to find savings for the dollars it spent.

Unfortunately, after President Clinton left office, the next administration and Congress regularly waived PAYGO rules and ultimately allow them to expire in 2002.

After waiving and allowing these rules to expire, we saw the surplus built by the Clinton administration vanish, and deficit spending resume—spending that will have to be repaid by our children and grandchildren.

A New York Times analysis attributes 90% of that deficit to the economic downturn, Bush administration policies, and the extension of those policies. According to that analysis, only 7% of the deficit is attributable to the Economic Recovery Act passed early last year, which economists largely agree was a necessary emergency response to this recession.

Madam Speaker, this is just good policy. For eight years, under the previous administration, we saw deficit spending spiral out of control. Now many of those responsible for that spending are criticizing the majority and the current administration for its spending policies, complaining that it is piling up debt for the next generation.

Today those individuals have a chance to vote for legislation that ensures any future programs are paid for, and reestablish the rules that led to control in government spending and budget surpluses in the 1990s.

I am an original cosponsor of the PAYGO legislation that passed the House last July, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to set our nation back on a path to sustainable spending policies that will ensure we do not have to continue increasing the debt limit indefinitely.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the provisions in the bill before the House that restore the pay-as-you-go budget rules.

The PAYGO rules simply require that new entitlement spending and new tax cut proposals be fully paid for with offsetting savings. Failure to do so would result in mandatory spending cuts. These rules were instrumental to the successful effort to rein in soaring deficits in the 1990s and resulted in balanced budgets during the final years of the Clinton administration. Unfortunately, the pay-as-you-go rules expired in 2002 and the Bush administration and the then Republican majority in Congress refused to renew them. Our nation's fiscal health has paid a heavy price for that refusal.

Yesterday, the House Ways and Means Committee heard testimony from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Specifically, Dr. Orszag testified that the large deficits we confront today in large measure reflect the failure to pay for policies in the past. Dr. Orszag said, "More than half of these deficits can be linked to the previous administration's failure to pay for the 2001/2003 tax cuts and the prescription drug bill. Over the next ten years, these two unpaid-for policies are slated to add $5.8 trillion to the deficit, including interest expense on the additional associated debt."

Returning to the budget discipline of the pay-as-you-go rules is common sense and will help ensure that we don't repeat the reckless tax and spending mistakes of the past.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss our national debt.

Let's look at the facts of how we got here. Just 10 years ago, the National Debt clock was turned off and we were having serious conversations about what would happen after we paid down the debt. Our nation was running a budget surplus in 1998, starting a stretch of surpluses that lasted through 2001. Our nation's fiscal house was in order. How then, have we gone from surpluses to significant deficits?

Some would have us believe that the national debt suddenly appeared in the past year. If only it was that easy. The national debt level we see today is the result of 8 years of poor decisions. Earlier this decade, the Republican-controlled Congress voted to slash taxes for the wealthy and charge it to the national debt. The same party voted to create a prescription drug benefit and charge the entire cost to the national debt. I voted against both of these laws because they were fiscally irresponsible. The previous President decided to pursue two wars on borrowed money and charge it to the national debt. In contrast, the policies that we have adopted this Congress to pull our economy out of the recession are responsible for less than 16 percent of this and last years' deficit.

Because of the irresponsible decisions of the recent past, we entered this recession with our fiscal house not in order. With our economy nearing collapse, our government had a choice to make. Facing the worst economic crisis in 75 years, we could have done nothing. Yet, this was not a responsible option. During times of great hardship, our government cannot shrink away from helping our citizens and helping our economy recover. This required federal investment. Leading economists have made clear that these investments were vital and that the best way to reduce the deficit in the long-term is through a strong economy.

One major reason for the debt we see today is because President Bush and the Republican-controlled Congress allowed the "pay-as-you-go" law to expire. Every family understands this principle—you must pay for what buy. I am saddened that Congress forgot this simple lesson earlier this decade. This is only one tool, but it is a strong one to return our nation back to fiscal stability. It forces Congress to identify inefficient or ineffective programs whose funding can be cut to fund higher priorities, such as health care, education, and clean energy.

The bill we consider today restores this budgetary safeguard and makes the "pay-as-you-go" principle law. In the 1990s, the last time that "pay-as-you-go" was the law, we turned the massive deficits of the 1980s into record surpluses. In 2007, I was pleased that the House of Representatives restored this principle in the House rules when Democrats regained control of the House. While this rule was a good first step, today's legislation goes further by applying automatically to legislation and will cut spending if Congress does not do so.

In addition, this bill would require the Government Accountability Office, GAO, to review all programs and initiatives to find any duplicative or wasteful programs. The GAO would report what they find to Congress so that we can eliminate the wasteful programs and merge any duplicative ones.

I will continue to work to ensure taxpayer money is well spent. I helped write the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, which will reduce our debt by $10 billion by eliminating wasteful subsidies for banks to offer student loans. I am pleased that many other major bills being considered, including health reform and climate legislation, have been paid for and would reduce the debt as well. I have fought every year to cut billions from the flawed missile defense program, which never produced a reliable technology; I have supported reducing agricultural subsidies that too often go to the wealthiest producers instead of small family farmers; and I have advocated for eliminating subsidies to private insurance companies for providing the same services that Medicare already provides to seniors. These are all common-sense steps to reduce wasteful government spending.

This legislation sends a message to the American people that the government is committed to putting the country back on stable economic footing. I will vote for this bill and will work for our government to regain its fiscal discipline.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 45, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act, PAYGO.

As a former small business owner, I know the importance of keeping your books balanced and your budget in order. The PAYGO Act's concept is simple, if you propose new spending or reduced revenues it must be paid for by reducing spending in other areas.

Today's vote in favor of Statutory PAYGO is one of the most important actions Congress has taken towards ensuring economic discipline and restoring a balanced federal budget. PAYGO does not solve all of our budget problems overnight, but it has a history of bipartisan support and proven results dating back to the 1990s. During my first term, PAYGO helped right the ship and put our nation on a path toward replacing deficits with surpluses.

PAYGO has a proven track record of success, turning deficits in record surpluses under President Clinton. As we work to address the deficits we have inherited from the last administration, PAYGO is a key part of our effort to restore balance.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I support Statutory PAYGO, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the passage of H.J. Res. 45.

Mr. BOYD. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the previous question is ordered.

The question of adoption of the motion is divided. The first portion of the divided question is on concurring in the matter preceding title 1 of the Senate amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the first portion of the divided question is adopted.

The second portion of the divided question is: Will the House concur in the matter comprising titles 1 and 2 of the Senate amendment?

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the second portion of the divided question will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 960.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Cassidy
Clay
Davis (TN)
Ehlers
Gutierrez
Linder
Meeks (NY)
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Radanovich
Stark
Stupak
Thompson (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1549

Messrs. TAYLOR, SMITH of Nebraska and MCINTYRE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 48, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 48, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 960.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 960.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS PILOT EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, S. 2950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2950.

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.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2010, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2010

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, February 5, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1600

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SECRETARY UDALL

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Last week, former Secretary of the Interior and Representative Stewart Udall celebrated his 90th birthday. The proud father of Senator TOM UDALL and uncle of Senator MARK UDALL, Secretary Udall now resides in my home State of New Mexico.

Stewart Udall's legacy is visible throughout our country from his time as Interior Secretary for Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. It is visible in the lands he protected and the laws he enacted, groundbreaking law that protected our water, air, and animals in their natural habitats. In his tenure, the United States enacted the Clear Air Act, the Wilderness Act, the Endangered Species Act, and many others.

When he left public office, he continued his work, taking up the cause of Navajos who suffered the effects of uranium mining. Secretary Udall advocated for the passage of early legislation to protect harmed uranium miners and their families while instigating cleanup efforts.

Secretary Udall let compassion and common sense guide his career in public service. He is a great American and a great New Mexican.

Happy birthday, Secretary Udall.

SHORT-SIGHTED DECISION ON F–22S

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on Friday, January 29, Russia's fifth-generation fighter jet, with stealth capabilities, successfully completed its first test flight. This is an ominous development indeed, as it comes on the heels of the Obama administration's decision to terminate production of our own fifth-generation air superiority fighter, the F–22A Raptor.

The administration's decision to end the F–22 program at 187 aircraft was clearly not driven by military requirements, as a longstanding Air Force requirement for the F–22, developed to meet the national military strategy, is 381. While President Obama and Secretary Gates were expending great capital in shorting the Air Force by nearly 200 F–22s, it should be clear to all of us what the Russians have been doing.

Air superiority is not something we should take for granted, Madam Speaker, for owning the skies is what enables us to own the battlefield. The President's shortsighted decision on the F–22 ignores the possibility that at some point in the future, we could find ourselves in conflict with a conventional military power that could challenge our air superiority, a possibility I don't think any of us would like to imagine.

EXECUTIVES, SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, AND UNION MEMBERS SAY ''ENFORCE IMMIGRATION LAWS''

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, according to a new Zogby poll, senior executives, business owners, and members of union households think the best way to deal with illegal immigration is to enforce the law. When asked to choose between enforcement or a pathway to citizenship with conditions, 59 percent of executives, 67 percent of small business owners, and 58 percent of union households chose enforcement. When asked whether more immigrants are needed to address our job needs or if there are enough Americans to fill them, 61 percent of executives, 65 percent of small business owners, and 72 percent of union households said there are plenty of Americans available to fill unskilled jobs.

These findings are no surprise. Citizens and legal immigrants should not be forced to compete with illegal immigrants for scarce jobs.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT FROM THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, today Congress voted to raise the national debt limit to $14.3 trillion, or $121,000 per American family today. The vote is the third debt increase since the Democrats took control of Congress and they have passed a debt increase three times in the last 12 months. This is a burden to small businesses and communities, will hurt our economic growth and prosperity for years to come, will raise interest rates and hurt our ability for our communities to gain jobs.

This is irresponsible, and yet it's merely a symptom of the problem. The problem is that Washington cannot control its spending.

We need folks in Congress who will look at the budget line by line, as the President pledged in the last campaign, and look at how to root out waste, fraud, and abuse, and curb the growth of government and balance our budget. That is what the American people want, and that is what I am fighting for.

PAYGO PROTECTS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, many people might not be focused on the work that was done today and led by the Democratic Caucus, and I think it's important to reinforce what we did today. We protected the American people. We protected our veterans. We protected our seniors with Social Security and Medicare. We protected the most vulnerable, our children.

As everyone knows, our children have, many times, the least opportunity for health care reform except for the work that we did just a few months ago when we worked to enroll some 11 million more children in the Children's Health Insurance Program. But at the same time as we move forward, we know more and more children are uninsured.

The PAYGO work that we did and the work that we did addressing the question of this Nation's deficit was clearly not a selfish act; it was a selfless act. And that is to say to our seniors, We'll never forget you. We'll never abandon your Medicare and Social Security.

Our veterans have offered themselves on behalf of this Nation, and we will never, never forget our veterans and our soldiers. And we certainly will not forget the most vulnerable in our society who need food stamps and medical care.

We did the right thing today, and I am proud to have voted ''yes.''

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, everywhere I go in Wisconsin, people are saying the same thing: Government must live within its means. I agree. After all, being fiscally responsible is the Wisconsin way.

People all across northeast Wisconsin pay their bills on time, and they're tired of seeing their money wasted on bailouts for Wall Street speculators. Everyone, and I mean everyone, is rightfully angry, and so am I. We simply don't believe in rewarding failure in Wisconsin, and that is why I voted against every single bailout that came along.

And never forget, never forget how we fell into this mess.

When I was elected in 2006, the people in power in Washington, D.C., were pursuing borrow-and-spend policies, policies that drove our economy into the ditch without paying a single dime for them. Without paying for a single dime, the previous administration spent money we did not have on two wars—two wars at the same time—two tax cuts for the rich, gigantic handouts to big drug companies on Wall Street, and a trillion-dollar bailout for their friends on Wall Street in the big banks, and asking, asking our children and grandchildren to pay for it all.

Well, enough is enough. We must live within our means. Our government must invest in our own people right here at home, not on Wall Street and not overseas. We must rebuild our own economy and grow the jobs. We need to work our way back into prosperity.

When voting for any legislation, I only have the best interests of my constituents in Wisconsin in mind. The pay-as-you-go rules which were enacted today will be successful, as they were in the 1990s, and this is exactly the medicine we need today to begin to turn today's enormous debts into future surpluses. That is why I strongly support the passage of pay-as-you-go rules, just as I have seven times previously during my public service.

It's really a simple, responsible thing to do. Washington must live within its means and pay its bills on time, just as we do around our own kitchen tables every month across Wisconsin.

Mandatory pay-as-you-go rules are critical to reducing our national debt. Over time, these responsible spending rules will contain Federal expenditures and balance our budgets, for when government attempts to spend money on one program, it must either raise revenues or cut spending on another program. It's just that simple. Live within our means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DOES CONGRESS HAVE THE COURAGE TO CONFRONT THE ECONOMIC THREAT TO AMERICA'S FUTURE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chair, in the next hour we're going to be talking about a subject that has caught the attention of Americans. It's, generally speaking, a boring subject, but now it's not become boring anymore, and that is the problem with the Federal Government overspending, the problem with the budgets that have been proposed, the problem of the financial trajectory of our country and the threat that that trajectory poses.

I'd like to step back in time a little bit as a Republican to talk about the fact that over a 12-year period, Republicans had deficit spending in a number of years at about a hundred billion dollars or maybe a little more. If you put that all together over 12 years, you have over a trillion dollar amount of deficit spending.

But what we're looking at in 1 year now is over a trillion dollars. In other words, the Democrats are spending more in 1 year than we did in 12 years, or you could say that they're spending enough in 1 month to compensate for every year of the Republicans.

Now, the past President was criticized that he overspent; he spent too much money. His biggest deficit was in 2008 with the Pelosi Congress at about $450 billion of excessive spending.

Just the number of billion dollars, it's hard for us to recognize how does that relate to something. So let's put it in perspective and take a look at it as a percent of the gross domestic product of our country.

The $450 billion deficit with the Pelosi Congress and President Bush, that number would be about 3.1 percent of GDP. That is actually fairly average for many different years and different Presidents.

The 2008 deficit was followed by 2009, of course, and it was, again, the Pelosi Congress, but this time the Obama administration. And after all kinds of criticism of the Republicans for spending too much money, the budget was $1.4 trillion of deficit. That is three times worse than the worst year of President Bush.

□ 1615

Now we have heard all kinds of complaints that it was the Republicans' fault and all of these kinds of things. And yet the choice to spend that much deficit was still a choice, a choice made by our President and our current Congress under Speaker PELOSI, $1.4 trillion.

Now let's connect that, because $1 trillion is an awful lot of money, and it's very hard for us to understand. How does that connect to gross domestic product? Well, it turns out that 9.9 percent of our gross domestic product was in debt. That's almost 10 percent, just under 9. That's the highest level since World War II. That is an incredible level of deficit spending.

Now the question in people's minds becomes, okay, I'm not used to thinking in terms of billions and trillions of dollars. So how do we put this in perspective? And what does it mean to just the average citizen on the street? Well, one of the things it means is that we are really pushing the financial solvency of our country. We are getting to the point where we are spending money so rapidly, beyond our means, that we are driving ourselves into a condition of bankruptcy which could cause a massive collapse of our entire economic system. Nobody knows exactly when or what could trigger that kind of event.

These are very serious questions we are going to be discussing in the next hour. And I'm thankful to see Congressman WOLF, a very highly respected Congressman from this area. He is also going to share with us something about the situation with this budget and what it means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 54 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a Lutheran pastor executed for his efforts in the Nazi resistance during World War II, once said, ''the ultimate test of a moral society is the kind of world that it leaves to its children.'' These are timeless words that resonate deeply today as our Nation struggles to confront our growing national debt.

The release this week of President Obama's fiscal year 2011 budget projects a deficit of nearly $1.6 trillion, equivalent to 10.6 percent of economic output. I am convinced that addressing ballooning debt is not only an economic issue, but there is also a moral component to this issue that goes to the heart of who we are as Americans. Yet I wonder if we in Congress, America's political leaders, have lost the will to make the tough decisions necessary, decisions that could well require sacrifice.

The generation of Americans who came of age during the era of Dietrich Bonhoeffer has been affectionately called the Greatest Generation. Many of them have made unimaginable sacrifices, including their lives, for their children and their children's children. If we remember the legacy that we've inherited, the giants on whose shoulders we stand, I believe we, too, can be moved to do our duty. It will not be easy, but that which is worth doing rarely is.

However, should the 111th Congress fail to address the financial tsunami approaching our shores, it will be judged by history as a dysfunctional, fundamentally broken institution that neglected its responsibilities not only to its constituents we came here to serve, but to those future generations of Americans.

We are on that precipice.

It has been almost 4 years since I first came to the floor of the House proposing an independent bipartisan commission to address unsustainable Federal spending. The SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy, would operate in an authentic and transparent way, holding a series of public meetings across the country to hear from the American people. It would put everything on the table, entitlements and all other spending and tax policy. Its recommendations would not be made in a vacuum or over a weekend locked up at Andrews Air Force Base.

At the time of introduction, and still today, it is the only debt reduction commission legislation in play that mandates public engagement on this scale. It also would force Congress to vote up or down on the legislative package born from the commission's work. There would be no avoiding of hard choices.

When I first introduced the bill in the spring of 2006, I discussed the looming financial crisis facing our country and said that the longer we put off fixing the problem, the more bitter the medicine required to fix it would be. I also sought to address the objections of some who said the problem was too big to fix, too risky, particularly in a congressional election year, and an abdication of congressional responsibility.

At face value, there may be some merits to some of those objections, but these arguments ring hollow for the future that we face. They paralyze the Congress from moving forward. They allow the Congress to blindly continue to spend. They provide an excuse for the status quo. They allow us to stick our heads in the sand, all to the detriment of the country.

Consider that from 2011 to 2020, the Congressional Budget Office projects staggering cumulative deficits of $6 trillion. Our Nation is broke. The national debt is now over $12 trillion and growing at rates that haven't been matched since World War II. Amazingly, the House earlier today followed the Senate action to increase the Federal debt limit to a staggering $14.294 trillion.

Significantly, these deficits are not first and foremost wartime deficits. Rather, we have amassed enormous unfunded obligations to ensure future entitlement benefits that, when added with liabilities like the debt, total nearly $57 trillion. That means every man, woman, and child owes $184,000.

Legitimate credit rating agencies have threatened in recent weeks to downgrade the United States from its current Triple A bond rating. The latest warning came just this week from Moody's, a top Wall Street credit agency, reacting to the President's budget. Moody issued a report saying ''unless further measures are taken to reduce the budget deficit further or the economy rebounds more vigorously than expected, the Federal financial picture as presented in President Obama's February 1 budget will at some point put pressure on AAA government bond rating.''

This news comes on the heels of Spain, Greece, and Dubai all seeing their credit ratings downgraded. Losing this ''gold standard'' would make it even more difficult to borrow money, would shake confidence in the dollar, and could lead to a situation where the dollar is no longer the primary international reserve currency. If that were to happen, prices for everything traded internationally, including food and oil, would go up.

Just this week, The Washington Post featured a piece by Allan Sloan, Fortune magazine's senior editor-at-large. He focused on a recent report from the Congressional Budget Office that shows that for the first time in 25 years, Social Security is taking in less in taxes than it is spending on benefits. Sloan writes, ''Instead of helping to finance the rest of the government, as it has done for decades, our Nation's biggest social program needs help from the Treasury to keep benefit checks from bouncing—in other words, a taxpayer bailout.'' He concludes, ''this year's Social Security cash shortfall is a watershed event. Until this year, Social Security was a problem for the future. Now it's a problem for the present.''

Social Security and Medicare are amassing huge deficits and are ill-prepared for the coming flood of new baby boom retirees. When our retirement security programs like Social Security and Medicare were established, the ratio of workers supporting each retiree was more than 10 times the number supporting retirees today.

The American people understand the depth of the country's spending problems and are leaps and bounds ahead of Congress in acknowledging the need to deal with this issue. A national survey taken in November revealed that 70 percent of those polled said a bipartisan commission is the best way to tackle the growing budget deficits and national debt. Seventy percent is a pretty convincing number.

Every Member of Congress knows how serious the Federal Government's spending is. But where are those willing to deal with it? The lyrics in Simon and Garfunkel's song ''The Boxer''—

''man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest''—aptly describe the mood on Capitol Hill when it comes to addressing Federal spending.

Every day that passes without action is a day that entitlement spending continues to diminish vital discretionary dollars currently being used for domestic and foreign priorities.

But where will the money to meet the needs of the American people come from if these dollars continue to shrink because mandatory spending is taking a growing piece of that pie? If we do not begin to rein in spending, every penny of the Federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending by 2028. The implications are staggering. The New York Times ran an article on the front page the day after the President's budget was submitted to Congress which captured this approaching reality. It said, ''unless miraculous growth, or miraculous political compromises, creates some unforeseen change over the next decade, there is virtually no room for new domestic initiatives for Mr. Obama or his successors.''

What does that mean in real terms?

Do you care about national defense and homeland security in a post-9/11 world? There will not be any money left. Do you care about improving our Nation's crumbling transportation infrastructure? There won't be any money left. Do you care about returning a man to the Moon? There will not be any money left. Do you care about this country leading the way in scientific innovation and technological advancement? There will not be any money left. Do you care about finding a cure for cancer, Alzheimer's, autism and Lyme disease? There will not be any money left.

Do you care about helping the vulnerable populations around the world, the orphan, the widow, the HIV/AIDS patient? There will not be any money left. Do you care about sending aid to countries devastated by natural disasters like Haiti after the earthquake? There will not be any money left. No money. Zero. Every penny of the Federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending.

The sheer size of the Federal deficit and national debt are astounding. But the narrative that will accompany these numbers if Congress continues to do nothing will be even more devastating. Its implications are not just economic but also encompass our national security.

Wall Street Journal columnist Gerald Seib made just this point last week. He wrote, ''the Federal budget deficit has long since graduated from nuisance to headache to pressing national concern. Now, however, it has become so large and persistent that it is time to start thinking of it as something else entirely: A national security threat.''

Foreign lenders already own nearly 40 percent of our domestic economy. Our biggest ''bankers'' are China, Japan and oil-exporting countries like Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia was home to the 9/11 terrorists. Saudi Arabia's Wahhabi brand of Islam is taught in some of the most radical mosques and madrassas around the world, including along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. Saudi Arabia continues to view floggings and beheadings with a sword as legitimate means of punishment. They have repressed women. They persecute Christians and those of the Jewish faith. Their textbooks are filled with hateful messages about minority faiths. Is this a country that we want to be beholden to?

What about communist China, which routinely violates the basic human rights and religious freedom of its own people, where Catholic bishops, Protestant pastors and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith? I've seen how they plundered Tibet with my own eyes.

The U.S. intelligence community notes that China's attempts to penetrate U.S. agencies are the most aggressive of all foreign intelligence organizations. According to the FBI, Chinese intelligence services ''pose a significant threat both to the national security and to the compromise of U.S. critical national assets.'' Weapons that entities of the People's Republic of China supplied to Iran were ''found to have been transferred to terrorist organizations in Iraq and Afghanistan.''

China is a major arms supplier and source of economic strength to the regime in Sudan. They have been the major obstacle to ending the genocide in Darfur. Our efforts to exert diplomatic pressure against Iran's nuclear weapons program have been thwarted by China's opposition to the U.N. Security Council sanctions against Iran. Do we really want China to be our banker?

These foreign countries, with vastly different aims than our own, could end up negatively influencing U.S. foreign policy by threatening to dump our currency in the world market. Such actions would not be a historical anomaly. Recall 1956 in the Suez Canal crisis, which some believed signaled the end of Britain and France as world powers. Egypt announced that it was going to nationalize the canal, which outraged the British and French, who then devised a plan to use military force to keep control. The U.S. wanted to avert conflict at any cost. And President Eisenhower threatened to sell the U.S. reserves of the British pound, which would essentially result in the collapse of the British currency. The British changed course.

Is it conceivable to imagine the Saudis threatening to dump our currency if we don't withdraw from the region? Is it conceivable to imagine China threatening to dump our currency if we don't stop pressing nuclear-armed North Korea?

Simply put, we are presently borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars from countries which pursue aims that are at odds with our national interest and values, both directly and indirectly.

□ 1630

How did America reach this unsustainable spending level? There is plenty of blame to go around for lack of action from both political parties. It has been an equal opportunity spending society.

I tried to get the Bush administration on board from July 2006 to April 2008. I then wrote Treasury Secretary Paulson more than a dozen letters imploring him to embrace the bipartisan SAFE process. Two months before then, President-elect Obama took the oath of office. I wrote to ask him to support the SAFE Commission initiative, which Congressman JIM COOPER and I were advocating as the best way forward to rein in America's debt.

Last week, after years of effort, the commission finally got its day of debate on the Senate floor, and we came as close as we have gotten to creating this bipartisan panel legislatively. The Senate considered a measure put forward by Senators CONRAD and GREGG, in many ways companion legislation to the SAFE Commission. During the debate, Senator CONRAD pointed to a recent Newsweek cover story, ''How Great Powers Fall: Steep Debt, Slow Growth, and High Spending Kills Empires—and America Could Be Next.''

He quoted from the article that ''this is how empires decline. It begins with a debt explosion. It ends with inexorable reduction in the resources available for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. If the United States doesn't come up soon with a credible plan to restore the Federal budget to balance over the next 5 to 10 years, the danger is very real that a debt crisis could lead to a major weakening of American power.'' Sobering words, but hardly alarmist.

Senator GREGG in his floor speech also described before us in stark terms. He said, ''We are on an intolerable path, a path of unsustainability, a path which leads us down the road to a Nation which is less prosperous and has a lower standard of living than what we received from our parents.''

Similar to the remarks of Senators CONRAD and GREGG, underscoring the crisis we face, The New York Times story referenced earlier also reports candidly about this same issue and cites historical precedent.

The Times reported: ''The United States could begin to suffer the same disease that has afflicted Japan over the past decade. As debt grows more rapidly than income, the country's influence around the world erodes.''

Charles Krauthammer in October also described the prospect of America's decline but laid it squarely in our laps to choose. He said, ''For America today, decline is not a condition. Decline is a choice. Two decades into the unipolar world that came about with the fall of the Soviet Union, America is in the position of deciding whether to abdicate or retain its dominance. Decline, or continued ascendancy, is in our hands.''

Last year, the well-respected Center for the Study of the Presidency and

Congress, published a report titled, ''Saving America's Future: A Challenge to the American People.'' It paints a stark and troubling picture of our Nation's challenges. One of its recommendations was to create a bipartisan commission to deal with the looming financial crisis.

At the press conference unveiling the report, the study panel's cochairman, Norm Augustine, the former chairman and CEO of Lockheed Martin, voiced a similar warning. He said, ''In the technology-driven economy in which we live, Americans have come to accept leadership as the natural and enduring state of affairs. But leadership is highly perishable. It must be constantly re-earned.

''In the 16th century, the citizens of Spain no doubt thought they would remain the world leader. In the 17th century, it was France. In the 19th century, Great Britain. And in the 20th century, it was the United States.

''Unless we do something dramatically different, including strengthening our investments in research and education, the 21st century will belong to China and India.''

George Will's column in The Washington Post today echoes these themes of China's ascent. He cites Robert Fogel, a Nobel Prize-winning economist, who predicts that ''by 2040, China's GDP will be $123 trillion, or three times the entire world's economic output in 2000. China's 40 percent share of the global GDP will be almost triple that of the United States' 14 percent.''

Despite these alarm bells these statements set off, the Senate failed to approve the Conrad-Gregg amendment. The vote was close. A majority was on board, but the final tally came up seven votes short: 53–46. I salute Senators CONRAD and GREGG, as well as the other 44 Senators who voted for the commission, for the profiles in courage they showed.

In the aftermath of that defeat, the President, who only at the 11th hour had endorsed Conrad-Gregg, proposed in his State of the Union address the creation of a fiscal commission by executive order. His budget document reflected that proposal, though only in broad terms without any formal language or timeline.

When I first heard that he was considering such a plan, I came to the House floor to voice my skepticism about an executive commission without congressional approval. Those concerns are undiminished as more details have emerged.

One of the most authentic provisions of the SAFE Commission is its mandate for an up-or-down vote in the Congress. The establishment of fiscal commission by executive order that does not require Congress to vote on its findings is what could be called ''big hat, but no cattle,'' a big hat used for political cover for elected officials who aren't willing to make tough choices in an election year.

Simply put, a commission established through executive order will make it look like Washington is finally doing something to address runaway spending, but without the teeth to require action. It will amount to nothing more than another report collecting dust on the bookshelf. It will not make a difference. A real commission must be authentic, accountable, and transparent. It must involve the American people. It must require legislative action.

A commission through executive order fails on all those counts. It will be viewed by the America people as cover for the billions of dollars added to the deficit in recent spending legislation, such as the $787 billion in economic stimulus that has failed to move the unemployment rate below 10 percent, or the nearly $1 trillion in health care reform being negotiated behind closed doors, or other huge budget breakers widely unpopular in the eyes of the American people.

And if by some miracle Congress were forced to vote on the recommendations of such a fiscal commission, it would be after November with a lame duck Congress filled with Members who are retiring and may have already secured new jobs as lobbyists, or those who were defeated. Where would the accountability to the constituents be that they represent?

Just this week, the President submitted a budget that includes unprecedented spending and borrowing: some $1.4 trillion in new taxes, $8.5 trillion in additional deficits, $3.8 trillion in government spending this year alone, and $100 billion proposed for another dubious stimulus package, and all submitted with the claim that the administration's fiscal commission will put the country on a fiscally sustainable path. Where is the credibility?

There has been much analysis of Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN's upset victory in Massachusetts. For the record, SCOTT BROWN, too, has voiced his support for the bipartisan commission and said if he had been seated before the vote on Conrad-Gregg, he would have voted for the amendment.

One thing that the pundits and politicians in Washington ought to take away from his election is that the American people lack trust in their elected officials and have grown weary of the status quo. The American people want their voices to be heard. The American people are deeply concerned about record spending. The American people expect more from their elected leaders. We have to prove to them that we are listening.

I am among those who believe that Republicans can and will regain a majority in the House; and when we do, I am hopeful that we will have the courage to prove to the American people that we are listening. We must take the bold action necessary to address runaway spending, something that we failed to emphasize in recent years.

To Members of my own party who prefer to bide their time in the hope that we are successful in November, I respectfully submit we cannot wait to deal with this growing threat to our economy and standard of living. In fact, I have been deeply disappointed that many with whom I typically find common cause, Americans for Tax Reform and The Wall Street Journal, among them, have been some of the most vocal in their opposition to the commission idea, stating their fear that it would ultimately prove to be a vehicle for tax increases.

Interesting, they have found themselves keeping company with MoveOn.org, the service employees union SEIU, and AFL–CIO, and NOW, all of whom have come out opposed to our legislation. Those organizations' reason, of course, is entirely opposite, with the fear the commission would cut their closely guarded spending programs.

Yes, MoveOn.org, which maliciously and unnecessarily launched personal attacks on respected Army General David Petraeus. Remember the General Betray Us ads? And the same Service Employees International Union, whose president Andy Stern was the most frequent visitor to President Obama's White House in the first months of his Presidency and turned out more than 100,000 volunteers to fund his campaign. And the same AFL–CIO which is pushing organized labor's agenda and legislation that would strip workers of their right to a secret-ballot election when it comes to union representation.

During the Senate consideration of the Conrad-Gregg measure, Senator VOINOVICH, an early champion of the commission, aptly described the political landscape: ''Since the possible passage of this commission has become a reality, special interest groups on both sides of the aisle have assailed it as terrible. The taxpayer organizations on the right warn that the commission will increase taxes. The liberal groups on the left warn it will result in cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and other government programs. If the left and the right is so unhappy,'' Senator VOINOVICH said, ''with this, this has to be good legislation.''

I want to be absolutely clear: I am a fiscal conservative. I worked with senior staff at the Heritage Foundation, a bastion of conservativism, among others, in drafting the SAFE Commission legislation. I believe that the economy grows when people keep more of their hard-earned money, and my voting record reflects this belief. I do not favor tax increases.

In fact, I would support a short-term moratorium on Social Security payroll taxes as the ultimate economic stimulus to put more of taxpayers' hard-earned money back into their hands so they can invest in the economy. This would cost less than a so-called stimulus and would create jobs.

As sometimes happens around here, positions are staked out before the actual bill text is ever read. So I encourage my colleagues, especially on my side of the aisle, to actually read the

SAFE Commission bill. It is a bipartisan process.

The legislation text protects the minority by requiring a supermajority, 12 of 16 of the commission's members, to be in agreement before any legislative recommendations are sent to Congress for an up-or-down vote. I do not believe that minority Members are likely to be appointed to this type of commission by the Republican leadership. PAUL RYAN, ranking member on the House Budget Committee, and DAVE CAMP, ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee, they would not waiver in their opposition to tax increases. To say that this would bring about tax increases, it is wrong.

Senator GREGG underscored this point during consideration of the Conrad-Gregg amendment. Senator GREGG said, ''One presumes that whoever goes on this task force, if chosen by the leaders of their party in the Senate, whether Senator REID or Senator MCCONNELL, or leaders of the party in the House, Ms. PELOSI or Mr. BOEHNER, is going to reflect fairly aggressively the viewpoints and philosophies of the different parts. It will be a bipartisan report, or it will not be a report at all. Then it comes to the Congress, and has to be voted up or down by a supermajority. Once again, it basically moots the ability to game it. One side can't game the other. The proposal must be bipartisan and fair.''

In short, without Republican support, any attempt to raise taxes would never see the light of day on the House floor. The SAFE bill was carefully crafted to ensure a bipartisan process and to protect the rights of the minority party.

Given the enormity of the challenge, the commission needs to be able to look at every component of our fiscal policy to fairly assess where we stand and how we can best move toward a sound financial future. In looking at revenues, the legislative language is clear that any changes in the Tax Code must help simplify the system and stimulate increased economic growth and, thereby, tax revenue. But what no one is saying is that by opposing the commission concept altogether, and failing to put forward any viable alternative, those who most adamantly oppose tax increases essentially ensure they will happen down the road.

The issue is that if we don't do something now about the deficit, the debts that continue to mount at record levels will guarantee tax increases in the future. The longer it takes to address this issue, the more draconian the options will be when Congress is forced, which they will most surely be, to change course.

I have repeatedly challenged colleagues on both sides of the aisle who question the SAFE Commission to come up with another solution to the deficit and debt crisis that can pass Congress.

Without a special process like the SAFE Commission, which is based on the successful Federal base-closing process, I am convinced Congress will never put a mechanism in place to control government spending.

Quite frankly, both parties have failed to face up to the entitlement challenges in recent years. Given the enormity of the country's financial turmoil, I remain convinced that the bold steps needed to control deficit spending will never be taken through regular order in a Congress that is so politically controlled by special interests. Our entire political system is now so polarized that many only think in terms of red or blue ideology at the expense of a shared national interest.

Time is growing short. If lawmakers are serious about the debt and the deficit, issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress will halt the budget gimmicks, the slick talking points, and muster the political will to have an honest conversation with the American people about where we are, where we are headed, and what changes need to be made to get us back on track.

□ 1645

That is what the SAFE Commission-like process is all about, a national conversation. The people of this country deserve an honest assessment about their Federal Government's future government savings account and checkbook, a discussion driven not by politics but by statesmanship. The American people deserve a discussion which elevates the Nation's sights.

The consequences of inaction are simply too great to put this issue on hold and rely on a fake commission. We need a process that will produce measurable results, a process that will foster a renaissance in the country, will allow us to honestly tell our children that the foundation of America that they are inheriting is just as strong and just as promising as the America that our parents left us. I long to be able to tell my five children and my 15 grandchildren that that is the case.

Abraham Lincoln, one of our Nation's most admired and greatest Presidents once said, ''You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today.'' Yet that is exactly what Congress is poised to do if it fails to act.

In closing, Madam Speaker, nearly 4 years ago I visited the site of George Washington's crossing the Delaware River in anticipation of the Battle of Trenton. The iconic scene is depicted in the painting which hangs in the west wing of the White House. Washington was down to only 3,000 soldiers, and the cause of liberty looked to be headed for defeat. Yet with great courage and sacrifice, Washington and his forces were successful in changing the direction of the American Revolution, and therefore the course of history.

Their legacy is a rich one, and it is ours. If we are mindful of this legacy, of the sacrifices of so many previous generations of Americans, I believe we will move to take action. I believe that we will rise in our midst, profiles in courage. I believe we will make the sacrifices necessary for the betterment of this country.

I close with the words of Washington himself, the cautionary words from his 1796 farewell address. He said, ''We should avoid ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of what we ourselves ought to bear.'' Indeed, this is our burden to bear. I ask my colleagues, will we falter under its weight or rise above it as befitting this great Nation?

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and February 3 on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KAGEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KAGEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCHENRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 11.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 5, 2010, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6006. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-8053] received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6007. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Temporary Rule Regarding Principal Trades with Certain Advisory Clients [Release No. IA-2965; File No. S7-23-07] (RIN: 3235-AJ96) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6008. A letter from the Office of Research and Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — School Food Safety Program Based on Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point Principles [FNS-2008-0033] (RIN: 0584-AD65) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6009. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Methyl Esters of Conjugated Linoieic Acid (Cis-9, Trans-11 and Trans-10, Cis-12-Octadecadienoic Acids) [Docket No.: FDA-2003-F-0398] (Formerly Docket No. 2003F-0048) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6010. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0038] (RIN: 2127-AK44) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6011. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment [Docket No.: NHTSA-2007-28322; Notice 3] (RIN: 2127-AK66) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6012. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability for Italy (Transmittal No. 0C-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6013. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease with the Government of Australia (Transmittal No. 06-09) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6014. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease with the Government of United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. 08-09) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6015. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 136-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6016. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 158-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6017. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 152-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6018. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 138-09 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6019. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the heading ''Loan Guarantees to Israel'' in Chapter 5 of Title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-11); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6020. A letter from the Writer/Editor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extending Period of Optional Practical Training By 17 Months For F-1 Nonimmigrant Students With STEM Degrees and Expanding Cap-Gap Relief for All F-1 Students With Pending H-1B Petitions [DHS No.: ICEB-2008-0002; ICE No. 2124-08] (RIN: 1653-AA56) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6021. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1104; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-16121; AD 2008-04-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) Recevied January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6022. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (ECF) Model AS332C, AS332L, AS332L1, AS332L2, SA330F, SA330G, and SA330J Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1008; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-62-AD; Amendment 39-16063; AD 2009-22-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6023. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ, -135ER, -135K, -135KL, -135LR, -145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0083; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-16137; AD 2009-26-02] received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6024. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Model SR22 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1162; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-066-AD; Amendment 39-16136; AD 2009-26-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6025. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA 330 F, G, and J Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1124; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-35-AD; Amendment 39-16128; AD 2009-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6026. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30700; Amdt. No. 3351] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6027. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC120B Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1118; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-60-AD; Amendment 39-16126; AD 2009-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6028. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimum and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30699 Amdt. No. 3350] received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6029. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Adjustment of Maximum and Minimum Civil Penalities [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0411] (RIN: 2137-AE48) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6030. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC225LP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1089; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-16-AD; Amendment 39-16101; AD 2009-09-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6031. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (BHTC) Model 407 and Model 427 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1123; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-03-AD; Amendment 39-16127; AD 2009-25-08] (RIN: 2120-A64) received January 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6032. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-243 Airplanes and Model A330-341, -342, and -343 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1109; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-16123; AD 2009-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6033. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-300, 747-400, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0682; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-16131; AD 2009-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6034. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, and -300 Series Airplanes; Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes; and Model A340-500 and -600

Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1112; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-237-AD; Amendment 39-16132; AD 2009-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6035. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q-108; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0885; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-17] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6036. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model BD-100-1A10 (Challenger 300) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1113; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-238-AD; Amendment 39-16133; AD 2009-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6037. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Colored Federal Airways; Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0824; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6038. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Jet Route J-20; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0888; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-23] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6039. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Manokotak, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0694; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-15] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6040. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Clarks Point, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0197; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-4] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6041. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elim, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0200; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-5] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6042. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Point (Pt.) Thompson, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0457; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-10] received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6043. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technology Innovation Program [Docket No.: 071106659-8716-02] (RIN: 0693-AB59) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6044. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — FY 2010 Measurement, Science and Engineering Research Grants Programs; Availability of Funds [Docket No.: 0911121401-91402-01] received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6045. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowships (SURF) NIST Gaithersburg and Boulder Programs; Availability of Funds [Docket Number: 0911121400-91403-01] received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

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. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HARE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4594. A bill to combat international violence against women and girls; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 4595. A bill to establish the Internet Freedom Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 4596. A bill to allow for enforcement of State disclosure laws and access to courts for covered Holocaust-era insurance policy claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 4597. A bill to increase the quantity of solar photovoltaic electricity by providing rebates for the purchase and installation of an additional 10,000,000 solar roofs and additional solar water heating systems with a cumulative capacity of 10,000,000 gallons by 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER (for herself, Ms. BEAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 4598. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Express Loan Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 4599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an elective payment for specified energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 4600. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer or release an individual detained at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base to the custody of another country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4601. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the Office of the National Nurse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOCCIERI:

H.R. 4602. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1332 Sharon Copley Road in Sharon Center, Ohio, as the ''Emil Bolas Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4603. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to expand the humanitarian parole policy announced on January 18, 2010, to children legally confirmed as orphans eligible for intercountry adoption by the Government of Haiti prior to the earthquake on January 12, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4604. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to prevent the spread of Asian carp in the Great Lakes and the tributaries of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that certain entities exempt from taxation (including business leagues and chambers of commerce) disclose sources and amounts of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the purposes for which Build America Bonds may be issued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 4607. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the purchase and processing of healthful commodities for use in school meal programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4608. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow multiemployer plans to amortize losses from certain fraudulent investment schemes over a 40-year period; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. MELANCON:

H.R. 4609. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to waive interest for certain loans relating to damage caused by Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, Hurricane Gustav, or Hurricane Ike; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 4610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the drawback fee on the manufacture or production of certain distilled spirits used in nonbeverage products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4611. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4612. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the procedures governing the closure or consolidation of postal branches and stations shall be the same as those applicable in the case of post offices; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 4613. A bill to settle land claims within the Fort Hall Reservation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4614. A bill to amend part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for incentive payments under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4615. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require dentists to provide patients with a fact sheet before performing any dental restoration work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should be a freeze on new discretionary nondefense, non-homeland security, non-intelligence spending whenever there is a Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. AKIN:

H. Res. 1071. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths vote on a stand-alone bill to increase the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H. Res. 1072. A resolution recognizing Louisiana State University for 150 years of service and excellence in higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H. Res. 1073. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month to recognize and honor 100 years of the enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KILROY (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HODES, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. NYE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. CAO, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 1074. A resolution honoring the life of Miep Gies, who aided Anne Frank's family while they were in hiding and preserved her diary for future generations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MASSA, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. FALLIN):

H. Res. 1075. A resolution commending the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA, and Mr. NYE):

H. Res. 1076. A resolution expressing gratitude and appreciation to the individuals and organizations that comprise the National Urban Search and Rescue System of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for their unyielding determination and work as first responders to victims of disasters and other incidents, including the victims of the recent earthquake in Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 240: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 390: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 391: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 463: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 470: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 504: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 510: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 690: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 994: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1067: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1074: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1079: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. WEINER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MACK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 1161: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1175: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1194: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1228: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1240: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1304: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1378: Mr. BURGESS, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1490: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1507: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1585: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1706: Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 1744: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1799: Mr. BERRY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1800: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1874: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1894: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1964: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1987: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2006: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 2064: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2067: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2109: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2110: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2156: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2255: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2256: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2296: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2305: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2377: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2406: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2421: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2546: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2556: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2565: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 2692: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2699: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2724: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2730: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2733: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2764: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2799: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2882: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2937: Ms. KILROY, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2941: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2999: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 3047: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 3212: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3238: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3245: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 3257: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3286: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 3355: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 3486: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 3510: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3519: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 3526: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 3560: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 3578: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 3592: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3668: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3705: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3712: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3715: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 3745: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3758: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 3786: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3952: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4051: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 4099: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4104: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4106: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4112: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 4115: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4116: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4123: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 4140: Ms. NORTON and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 4196: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CAO, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4224: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 4226: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4230: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 4233: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4241: Mr. HELLER and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4247: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4248: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4255: Mr. JONES and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 4262: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 4268: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4287: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 4296: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4324: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 4353: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 4360: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr BECERRA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4386: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4391: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 4403: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4415: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 4427: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4429: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 4437: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 4442: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4453: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4459: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 4472: Mr. PETERS and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4490: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 4503: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 4504: Mr. WU.
H.R. 4522: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 4527: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 4529: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 4530: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 4533: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4541: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4542: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4544: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4552: Mr. STARK and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 4554: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 4556: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4564: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 4568: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4571: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4573: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. KILROY, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.J. Res. 66: Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Res. 111: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Res. 173: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 213: Mr. FILNER, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HARE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 267: Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 526: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHULER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 577: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Res. 771: Mr. DRIEHAUS and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 904: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H. Res. 925: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H. Res. 927: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 929: Mr. SESTAK.
H. Res. 935: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 975: Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 997: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 1006: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 1032: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 1034: Mr. SCALISE.
H. Res. 1036: Mr. CARTER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PENCE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. FOXX, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 1039: Mr. PAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DENT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H. Res. 1040: Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 1046: Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILROY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WATSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CHU, and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 1048: Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CAO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MACK, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NYE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BEAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H. Res. 1053: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 1063: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 1067: Mr. NYE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BACA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FARR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STARK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. JONES, and Mr. POE of Texas.